SCRIPTVRE MISTAKEN

THE GROVND OF PROTESTANTS AND COMMON PLEA OF ALL NEW REFORMERS AGAINST THE ANCIENT CATHOLICKE RELIGION OF ENGLAND.

Many texts quite mistaken by Nouelists are layd open, and redressed in this treatis, by restoring them to theyr proper sense, according to which, it is made manifest, that none of them are of force against the ancient Catholicke Religion.

By IOHN SPENSER
of the Society of Iesvs.

Videtis id vos agere, vt omnis de medio Scripturarum auferatur auctoritas. S. Aug. li. 32. contra Faust. c. 19.

PRINTED AT ANTWERPE
By IAMES MEVRSIVS.
ANNO M.DC.LV.

The points of Controuerſie conteyned in this Treatis.

I. *Of vvorship of Saincts and Angles.* pag. 1.

II. *Of the making and vvorshipping of holy Images.* 69.

III. *Of Iuſtification by faith only.* 137.

IV. *Of the merit of good vvorkes.* 161.

V. *Of Purgatory.* 179.

VI. *Of the reall Preſence.* 189.

VII. *Of Communion vnder one kinde.* 317.

42.
43

THose victories are deseruedly inrolled amongst the most noble and memorable in the monumẽts of Antiquity, wherein an Enemy is ouercome with his own weapen. Thus Dauids beating down that Tower of the Philistines, seemed to the Israelites, to haue been a conqueſt ouer ten thowſand Enemies, *Saul percuſſit mille, & Dauid decem millia*, becauſe he cut of Golias head, with Golias ſword. Thus the ſone of God & our deareſt Sauiour, purchaſt the nobleſt of all victories, againſt the ſtrongeſt of all Enimies, *vt qui in ligno vincebat in ligno quoque vinceretur*. becauſe he who ouercame vs by a tree, was through him by a tree ouercome. And thus, our deare Redeemer hauing been furiouſly attacked by the Tempter in the deſert with the authority of his own word, put to flight and vauquiſhed the ſame Tempter by

the authority of the ſame word which he had preſſed againſt him. Hence it is, that not the ſling of Dauid wherewith he begunne, but the ſword of Golias was reſerued, and wrapt vp in a holy Ephod, in the Tabernacle, as an eternall trophe, and monument of his victory. Hence, that anciently moſt ignominious, & hatefull of creatures the croſſe, is now erected in triumphal maner not only vppon the higheſt towers of Chriſtian temples, but vppon the moſt ſacred and foueraigne heads of Chriſtian Emperours. And hence it alſo is, that the Catholicque Church, hath ſoe carefully conſerued, ſoe religiouſly honored, and glorioufly triūphed in thoſe breathes of diuinity the holy Scriptures, becauſe that as her ſpouſe ſtopt the fontaine, ſoe ſhe by the heat of his ſpirit hath dried vp the troubled and diuided ſtreames of all errours, and hereſies, trough theyr heauenly light and authority.

This is the victoty which I repreſent

in

in triumph in this preſent treatis, as the moſt heroicke amongſt all others of the Romane Church; becauſe it conquers hereſie, by the weapen of hereſie, vt qui *in verbo pugnabant, in verbo qnoque vincerentur*; *that thoſe vvho haue hitherto fought vvith the ſole vvord, might be ouercome vvith the ſole vvord.*

The Romane Church, euen from the firſt Challenge of her aduerſaries in theſe laſt ages, hath giuen them the foile (nay quite defeated them) at the weapens of Antiquity, vniuerſality, vnity, ſucceſſion, viſibility, ſanctity, miracles, Fathers, Councils, reaſon, anthority, but theſe were ſoe farre and clearly her weapens, that they ſcarce euer dirſt lay clayme to any of them, and ſoe the victory (glaſſed in theyr eyes) ſeemes eyther none, or ſmall, becauſe not gayned with a weapen of theyr chuſing, now therefore to accompliſh what ſhe hath ſoe proſperouſly attempted, ſhe accepts the combat euen with that weapen,

which they take (by miſtaking) to be theyr own.

It is the *vvritten vvord of God*, *the ſole vvritten vvord*, to which all appeall, here they boaſt and glory, here they exult and triumph, not only before the victory, but before the fight, this and this alone they take for theyr bucklar of defenſe, for theyr armour of proofe, for theyr deepe piercing dart, theyr ſwift flying arrow, and theyr ſharp edged ſword; this they brandiſh before the eyes of innocēts, with this they floriſh in theyr bookes, and Pulpits, in theyr publicque meetings, and priuate conuenticles, nay in the very ſtreetes, and tauernes; and that ſoe ſeemingly with a gloſſe as falſe as it is faire, that they dazle the eyes of the vulgar, and ſtrike them with admiration in each motion of it.

Here they fully perſwade themſelues that thoſe of the Roman Church dare not medle with them, and take for granted, that whatſoeuer wee haue gained vppon them by other weapens,

weapens, yet wee yeeld our ſelues clerely conquered by this. So confidēt are our Aduerſaries in theyr own conceipts! where as the Roman Church, neuer as yet acknowledged to haue been eyther worſted, or ſoe much as touched by any one text of Scripture which they euer preſſed againſt her, witneſſe the many & large volumes of full and cleere anſwers to euery ſentēce objected by her Aduerſaries. Neyther euer refuſed ſhe to incounter her enemies, with this weapen of theyr own chuſing. True it is ſhe requiers iudges preſent, to ſee and determine which party hath the better in the incounter, but they refuſe all other iudges (quite contrary to the light of reaſon) ſaue that very weapen where with they fight, and though ſhe ſtill keepe the feeld, continue on the cōbat, & maintaine the quarel, without ſoe much as yeelding eyther a ſtep or hairs breadth, not withſtāding ſhe muſt be worſted, only becauſe her aduerſaries ſay ſhe is.

What will an impartiall ey judge of ſuch proceedings? yet to ſhew how empty and vaine all theſe flotiſhes are, and how ſtrong deſires ſhe hath of the eternall good of her enimies, rather then leaue them wholy deſtitute of redreſſe, ſhe freely like an indulgent mother condeſceds to theyr infirmities, and conformes her ſelfe to theyr wayward humours, and that ſoe farre, as to expoſe the equitie of her cauſe euen to the iudgement of her very Aduerſaries, and confides with holy Dauid, *& inimici noſtri ſunt iudices*, that euen her moſt forward enimies, will not be ſoe voyd of light, reaſon, and equity, as not to acknowledge her conquerant, and themſelue vanquiſhed, euen in theyr own iudgements, and with theyr own weapen.

Thus ſhe enters the liſt, and confides in the ſtrength of her God and ſpouſe that the day wil be hers. And findes noe ſurer meanes to incompaſſe it, then by diſarming her enimie,

mie, becauſe to diſſarme him him, is to diſſanimate him, for yeeld he muſt, when he can feight noe longer.

I haue indeauored in this preſent Treatis, to giue my Readers an eſſay of this kinde of victory of the Roman Church, where in I hope he will finde it manifeſt that the texts which our Aduerſaries vſually alleadge againſt the Romane doctrine in ſuch points as I haue tuched, are not arguments, but miſtakes.

And that ſoe groſſe and palpable that halfe an ey may diſcouer them. Thus therefore the matter ſtands, and the combat proceeds betwixt vs.

Our Aduerſaries haue now aboue a hũdred yeares proclamed through the eares of Chriſtendome that the Romane Church reſiſts the known truth, and the euident teſtimonies of the written word of God: a heauy accuſation! I demand in the pourſuit of this diſcours, that theſe teſtimonies be cited and euidenced out of the authenticall editions, and originall

languages of the holy Bible. In place of theſe they preſſe the words of theyr own late tranſlations. Theſe I proue to be diſſonant & diſſagreeing from the originall, and ſoe not the words of true Scripture, but of a falſe tranſlation, will make againſt vs. They tell me that whatſoeuer the words are in the originall, yet the ſenſe is euidently againſt the Roman Church. I demād how, ſhall the ſenſe (at leaſt in theyr principle of ſole Scripture) euer euidently appeare but by the words of the originall. They tell me, whatſoeuer the words be, yet the ſenſe is euident. I reply that I am nothing mouued with theyr ſaing, without theyr prouuing. They bid me proue that it is not euident. I tell them, that it belongs to him who affirmes, to proue his own aſſertion. which if they refuſe, the whol world will diſcouer that they haue nothing euident in the whol Bible againſt the Tenets of the Roman Church. Yet to comply beyond all obligation, I vn-

der

dertake to proue that the texts which they moſt preſſe againſt vs, are neyther euidēt, not ſoe much as probable, but euidently inſufficient, and not ſoe much as capable of that ſenſe which they draw from them to make them ſound againſt vs, and conſequently nothing but pure miſtakes.

And yet farther, that nothing may be vvanting to a full victory, I preſſe againſt them clere vvords eyther out of theyr own Trāſlations, or out of the originall, the force whereof they cannot poſſibly auoyd, but eyther by denijng, the plaine and proper ſenſe of the vvords, and flying to tropes, and figures, & improprieties, & ſhadows and abſcurities, and that vvithout any neceſſity, ſaue only of mainteyning theyr own aſſertions; or tranſlating the vvords in a ſecondary ſignification, leauing the primary and moſt proper vvhen it makes againſt them, vvhich notvvithſtanding they put in other places vvhere it makes not againſt them; or by tranſlating the

words

words quite contrary to the originall (euē by theyr own acknowledgemēt) or vvhen they are ſoe troughly preſt that theyr is noe way of eſcaping, to reject the expreſſe words of the neuer queſtioned originall, and affirme that they crept out the margent into the text.

The diſcouery of theſe, and ſuch like particulars, is the maine drift, and ſumme of this Treatis. vvhich I haue intiteled, *Scripture miſtaken the ground of Proteſtants*, &c. The occaſion of my falling vppon which, vvas as follows.

This Treatis, vvas at firſt a priuate controuerſie, in anſwer to a long Cathalogue of texts, *taken (and miſtaken)* out of the Proteſtants Bible, and ſent to a Perſone of quality, to diuert him from the Romane faith. Through importunity of friends I condeſcended, that it might paſſe the print, hoping that ſome might reape profit from it, and therefore couched it in a plaine & eaſy ſtile that not only the learned,

but

but the vulgar alſo might vnderſtand it. I keepe my ſelfe cloſe to Scripture in the vvhol proceſſe, and connexion of my proofes eyther againſt my Aduerſary, or in my own cauſe, ſcarce affirming any thing vvhich I confirme not by one clere texr or other, and thoſe ſuch as I haue read, and diligētly examined my ſelfe, in vvhat language ſoeuer I cite them, and therefore, if any falſe dealing be found in the citations I am content, (as in that caſe I ſhould vvell deſerue) to bere the ſhame of it. The texts vvhich I anſwer, are thoſe vvhich are commonly, and cheefly ſtood vppon by Proteſtants, and indeede vvhich mainly vvithhold them from imbracing the Romane faith, and the points of controuerſie, ſuch as are the moſt preſſed againſt vs, and maintayned by our Aduerſaries, ſoe that I haue noe reaſon to doubt, if the Readers be once conuinced that they haue noe ground againſt vs euen in theyr own Bible in theſe maine, and radicall controuerſies, (as I am in greate

greate hope they vvil be) that they vvill at leaſt beginne to ſuſpect the vveakeneſſe of theyr own, and to diſcouer the ſtrength of our cauſe, and ſoe put themſelues in a fare vvay of returning to the boſome of that mother-church, from vvhich the late *miſtakers*, and *miſuſers* of holy Scripture haue ſeduced them. Some controuerſies of leſſer moment ſet down in the paper, I haue here omitted (which I reſerre to an other occaſion) being now preſſed, for vvant of time, to content my ſelfe vvith theſe.

Wherein that I may proceed vppon a ſuer foote, I obſerue this methode, firſt I ſet down plainly and vnqueſtionably, the Doctrine of the preſent Romane Church, deliuered as ſuch in the expreſſe vvords of the Council of Trent, in each controuerſy vvhich I treat, there by ſtating aright the queſtion, & diſabuſing the Proteſtant Readers, vvho are commonly vvholy miſſin formed of our doctrine, by a vvrong conceipt of it, inſtilled into them,

them, & preſerued in them, by eyther the malice, or ignorance of theyr Teachers.

Secondly I ſet down the Proteſtant poſitions, eyther as I finde them in the paper, or in the nine-and thirty Articles of the Engliſh Proteſtant church.

Thirdly, I cite and anſwer the texts, of the Aduerſary, by diſcouuering clerely the ſeuerall *miſtakes* cõteyned in them. and laſtly I alleadge ſome plaine paſſages of Scripture, as they ſtand in the Proteſtant Bible, in confirmation of our doctrine.

The greateſt fauour therefore that I expect from you deare contrymen, is, that you ſpare me not, neyther in troughly examining what I alleadge, nor in demanding ſatisfaction in matters which you cannot fully examine, of perſones abler, and learneder then your ſelues.

Pleaſe therefore to ponder vvhat you read noe leſſe impartially, then ſeriouſly, to diſingage your ſelues from

from that vvithdrawing bias, vvhich education, cuſtome, contry, friends, ſelfe loue, will, and iudgement haue inſenſibly inſtilled into your harts. labour with a ſtrong & humble deſire to be informed aright, with a loue of truth, aboue all tranſitory intereſts of this ſhort and miſerable life, & laſtly haue your earneſt recourſe to Allm. God, both to diſcouer what is beſt for your etetnal welfare, and to imbrace it when you haue diſcouered it, preferre God before creatures, your ſoul before your body, heauen before earth, and before time, eternity.



SCRIP-

SCRIPTVRE MISTAKEN
THE GROVND
OF PROTESTANTS, &c.

THE FIRST CONTROVERSIE.

Concerning the vvorship of Saints and Angells.

The doctrine taught, beleeued, and profeſſed in this point as matter of faith, by the Romain Church,

And diliuered in the Concil of Trent as Such. Seſſione 24.

MAndat ſancta Synodus omnibus Epiſcopis, & cæteris docendi munus, curamque ſuſtinentibus, vt — Fideles diligenter inſtruant, docentes eos, Sanctos vnà cum Chriſto regnantes, orationes ſuas pro hominibus Deo offerre; bonum atque vtile eſſe ſuppliciter eos inuocare; & ob beneficia impetranda, à Deo *per Filium eius Ieſum Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum, qui ſo-*

lus noster Redemptor & Saluator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere:

THe holy Synode commands all Bishops, and the rest which haue the office and care of teaching that — they diligently instruct faithfull people, teaching them, that the Saints which raigne togeather with Christ, offer vp theyr praires to God for men; that it is good, and profitable humbly to inuoke them, and to haue recourse to theyr praires, helpe, and assistance, to obteyne benefits of God *through his Sone Iesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Sauiour.*

Whence it is cleare, that according to the Council of Trent (to whose doctrine all those of the Romain Church hold themselues obliged to subscribe) first, that wee pray not the Saints, That they Should procure any blessings by theyr sole force and vertu independant of God, but only that they present theyr praires to God to obteyne them of him, for vs, *orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre*, which plainely cleares vs from all idolatry, in this particular, both they and wee praying to the same one only God. And secondly, we haue not recourse to theyr praires to God, as if they were to be granted for the worth and dignity of the Saints imdepedently of Christs merits, but only through and for his merits, *ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per Filium eius Iesum Chri-*

Christum Dominum nostrum, to obteyne benefits of God, through his Sone Iesus Christ our Lord, excluding the Saints from being eyther our Redeemers, or Sauiours, which we all acknwledge to be christ alone, *qui solus noster Redemptor & Saluator est*, as this holy Council here teaches vs, which makes vs, vndeniably free from the least shaddow of injury done to our Sauiour, and his infinite merits when we inuoke the Saints.

Thirdly we are here taught to giue reuence, and worshipp to the Saints in heauen *suppliciter eos inuocare*; to inuocque them humbly, deuoutly, suppliantly, neyther as Gods, nor as sauiours, but as pure creatures reigning with Christ, and as dependent of God, and Christ as we are our selues, as appeares by the former words of the Council now cited.

Lastly we are here taught, that this humble inuocation of the Saints (and the same is of Angels) is good & profitable, but the Council teaches not, neyther giues any generall commād to inuoke them, nor that the actual practice of it is absolutly necessary to Saluation, or that noe man can be saued, who has not thus humbly inuoked the Saints, for theyr praires are only furthering helpes, not necessary meanes to Saluation, soe that, noe man is bound to beleeue any absolute necessity of it, but in rigour it is sufficient not to reiect it as bad, or

hurtfull, but to allow of it as good and profitable, leauing the practice, or not practice, the greater, or leſſe uſe of it to euery ones particular piety, and deuotiō. This I ſay not to induce any one to thinke, that it were eyther laudable or allowable, in ſuch as beleeue the goodneſſe, and profit of this inuocation (as all Romain Catholicques muſt doe) neuer, or very ſeldome, to practice it, for this were to be ſupinely negligent in vſing the helpes, which wee beleeue to be profitable for our ſpirituall good, (as the ſame appeares in deſiring the praires of Gods ſeruants whilſt they liue here on earth, which is nor abſolutly neceſſary, but yet good and profitable) but I ſay it only, that all may know diſtinctly what the Council here teaches as neceſſary, and what only as good, and profitable, and to diſſabuſe vulgar Proteſtants, who thinke that the Romain church teaches, that it is as neceſſary to ſaluation to inuoke and worſhip the Saints, as to inuoke and worſhip Chriſt, himſelfe. Hauing thus declared the doctrine of the Romain church deliuered in the Council of Trent, let us now ſee, what Proteſtants alleadge againſt it, out of *Scripture miſtaken*.

The firſt Proteſtant Poſition,

Thus framed by the opponent.

God only to be worſhipped, therefore neyther Saint nor Angell.

This is proued *by Scripture miſtaken.* Mat.4.10.

It is written, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerue, ſaith Chriſt.

The firſt miſtake.

The words of this text affirme not that God only is to be worſhipped.

THe text ſaith thus, *thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God,* from which cannot be proued, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God *only*, that word *only* being not ioyned in this text, to the worſhip of God, as no Proteſtant can, or does proue that God *only* is to be feared, from the like text of Scripture. *Thou ſhalt feare the Lord thy God,* ſeeing that à wife is commanded to feare her huſband, Epheſ.5. 25. And ſubiects to feare theyr Magiſtrates, and Gouernours, Rom.13.4. Neyther is any one ſoe ſenſleſſe to affirme, that God *only* is to

Leuit.19. v.14.

Pſ 31.23. be loued, becauſe Dauid ſaies, *O loue the Lord all yee his Saints*, for if God only that is none ſaue God were to be loued then noe man were to loue his neighbour, which not with ſtanding is moſt ſtrictly commanded, as all know, nor huſbands to loue theyr wiues, which S. Paul commands Epheſ. 5. v. 25. and how come they then to proue, that God *only* is to be worſhipped, becauſe the Scripture here cited commands vs *to worſhip God*, but commands noe more to worſhip him *only*, then the former texts, to feare and loue him *only*. How come they, I ſay, to vrge ſuch à text as this, without the leaſt appearance of prooſe, but by à pure *miſtake* of the words of Scripture? eſpecially ſeeing that the Scripture in an other place, commãds vs as clearly to worſhip ſomething beſide God, as it commands to feare and loue others beſide God, Pſalme 99. 5. *worſhip his foorſtole*. where the very ſame Hebrew, and Greeke phraſe, and words are vſed, which are in this text cited. Mat. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God*; howſoeuer that text Pſal. 99. is miſtranſlated by Proteſtants, as I ſhall ſhew here after. Ande the Prophete Iſay foretels that the enimies of Hieruſalem, ſhould worſhip the ſteps of her feete, Iſay 60. 14. but what ſoeuer be meant by thoſe ſteps, certainly it cannot be God, therefore the text of Scripture, cited Mat. 4. commands not, that

God

God *only* ſhould be worſhipped. If any Proteſtant ſhoud ſay, that though the word *only*, be not ioyned to *worſhip*, yet it is ioyned *to ſerue* in the text cited, Mat. 4. *and him only ſhalt thou ſerue*, which ſeemes to be of as much force, as if it were ioyned to *worſhip*. I anſwer, that if the Opponent had framed the Proteſtant poſition thus, *God only to be ſerued, therefore neyther Saint nor Angell*, the latter part of the text hauing, *and him only ſhalt thou ſerue*, there might haue beene ſome ſhew of proofe, in alledging theſe words Mat. 4. But ſeeing the poſition runs thus, *God only to be worſhipped*, and the text ſaith not, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God *only*, but thou *ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God*, who ſees not, that there is noe ſhew at all of proofe in it? as when the Scripture ſayth, *Thou ſhalt feare the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerue*, one might at leaſt ſeemingly proue from this ſentence, *that God only, is to be ſerued*, but one ſhall neuer proue, by the force of thoſe words, *that God only is to be feared*. If a Proteſtant ſhould reply, that *worſhip*, and *ſerue*, ſeeme to ſignify the ſame thing, and ſoe *only* being added, to *ſerue*, is as much as if it were added to *worſhip*. I anſwer that if wee haue regard to the Greeke text, (in which only the difference betwixt *worſhip*, and *ſerue* in Mat. the 4. v. 10. is clearly diſcouered) there is a large difference betwixt thoſe two words, the one ſignifying Deut. 10. 20.

properly, and by mere force of the word, worſhip in generall, and ſoe vſed familiarly in holy Scripture, to ſigniſy both the worſhip due to God, and to men, Saincts, and Angells, and the other a ſeruice due to God only, and neuer applyed to the religious ſeruice of any creature, which I ſhall here after make manifeſt. Beſide, ſerue ſignifies more largely, then worſhip, for wee ſerue God by faith, hope, charitie, obedience, and all good workes done to his honour, but wee worſhip him, only by an act of Religion. As appeares. Hebr. 12. 28. let vs haue grace, wereby we may ſerue God acceptably with Reuerence and Godly feare.

MISTAKE II.

Worſhip *miſſapplied in this text*, Mat. 4. 10.

I Haue allready proued that this text, commands not that God *only* ſhould be worſhipped, becauſe it ſaies not thou ſhallte worſhip the Lord thy God *only*; but though it had ſaid ſoe, yet it were to be vnderſtood not to forbid, the exhibiting of all kind of worſhip to any ſaue God, but only ſuch worſhip as is proper to God alone, and which without Sacrilege, and Idolatry cannot be giuen to any but

but to God. Thus though Saint Paul ſay, that God only *hath immortality*, yet that muſt be vnderſtood of a moſt diuine, infinite, and vncreated immortality proper to God alone, and not of all kinde of immortalities, for then S. Paul would contradict him ſelfe, when he ſaith, that our *mortall bodies ſhall put on imuſortality*. Thus when our Sauiour ſaid, *none is good ſaue one, that is God*, it muſt only be vnderſtood of an eſſentiall, incomprehenſible goodnes, for otherwiſe, that text would be contrarie, to S. Luke, ſaying *and behould there was a man named Ioſeph, which was a counſeller, a good man and a iuſt*, and to that of the Acts which ſpeaking of S. Barnabas, ſaith that he was *a good man, and full of the holy Ghoſt*. Now as there are differeut kinds, of Immortalities and goodneſſes, the one infinitely perfect, diuine, eſſentiall, and vncreared, the other, imperfect, humane, accidentall, and created; ſoe that the ſcriptures aſcribing the one to God only, and the other to creatures, are eaſily reconciled, and playnly vnderſtood without any ſhew of contrariety, or contradiction, amongſt them ſelues, or iniury to God, ſoe are there in Scrtpture different kindes of worſhips, the one acknowledging, and exhibiting honour to, an Infinite, diuine, vncreated immortality, and goodeſſe in the Perſon, which he worſhips, and the other a creaded and finite; Thus in the text

1. Tim. 6. 15.
1. Cor. 15. 54.
Luc. 18. 19
Luc. 23. 25.
Acts 11. 24

cited, Mat.4.10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip, the Lord thy God*, though the word *worſhip*, conſidered in it ſelfe, ſignifie properly both theſe kinds of *worſhips*, yet as it lyes here, it muſt be taken for the firſt kinde, of higheſt and cheifeſt worſhip *only*; but the very ſame word, both in hebrew, greeke. latine, and Engliſh, in other places of Scripture, muſt be taken for the Second kinde of lower and inferour *worſhip*, acknowledging, and intending only to expreſſe, an imperfect, limited, and created goodneſſe, in the perſons, or things worſhipped.

Gen.49. 8. Thus we read in Geneſis, *The ſones of thy father ſhall adore*, or worſhipp *thee* Saith Iacob, bleſſing his ſonne Iuda. And of the bretheren of Ioſeph, ſaluting theyr brother, *when his bretheren had worſhipped him*, and nothing more ordinary in holy hcripture, then worſhip giuen to perſons in dignity, and authority. As therefore this Proteſtant poſition, *that God only is to be worſhipped*, being vnderſtood (at it muſt here by the opponent) that noe worſhip ath all is to be giuen to any ſaue God, playnly contradicts thoſe and the like places of Scripture. Soe the Romaine Catholique poſition, that *ſome kinde of worſhip, is to be exhibited to others, then God*, is both euidently conſonant to theſe texts, and noe way diſſagreeing, from that of Mat.4.10. and the like texts, wich command vs to worſhip God, nay though they ſhould command

Gen.41. 6.

mand vs to worſhip God, *only*, beecauſe ſuch commands are all wayes to be vnderſtood, of that firſt, and higheſt kinde of worſhip, aboue mentioned; neyther is there any poſſible meanes to reconcile, different places of Scripture, which ſeeme to aſcribe to God only, that, which in other places is aſcribed to creatures, but by ſuch diſtinctions, of perfections, or worſhips, as I haue declared. And this is ſoe cleare, that it muſt be, and is confeſſed, by Proteſtans themſelues, who generally graunt, that Religious worſhip is to be giuen to God only, but ciuil worſhip to creatures; wich diſtinction being once admitted, the opponent, will neuer be able to conuince any thing againſt the worſhip of Saincts and Angels, out of Mat. 4. 10. for if one will terme the worſhip giuen to Saincts and Angels, a ciuil worſhip, as I will preſently demonſtrate Proteſtants muſt doe, if they make noe diſtinction betwixt religious worſhips, then euen Saincts and Angles may be worſhipped at the leaſt with ſome kinde of *ciuil worſhip*, euen according to Proteſtants, notwithſtanding thath text of Mat. 4. 10. which according to them muſt be vnderſtood to forbid only Religious worſhip to any ſaue God. But becauſe the common tenet of Catholique Doctours is, that things created may be worſhipped with ſome kinde of Religious

worſhip,

worſhip, I will make it euident out of Scripture, that ſome Religious worſhip hath been, and may be lawfully exhibited to creatures, and ſoe not to God only. Thus wee read in the bookes of kings, that the
4. captaine of 50 men worſhipped Elias the
4.Reg.1. Prophete, and 50 men together the Pro-
13. phete Elizeus, and after the Sunamite re-
2. ceiuing her reuiued ſone, adored the ſame
4.Reg.2. Prophete; Theſame is of Moyſes commanded
15. to adore the groūd where on God ſtood, and
2. of Dauid commanding to worſhip the foot-
4.Reg.4. ſtoole of God. And leaſt it ſhould be thought
37. that this manner of worſhipping was only in
Exod.3.5. vſe in the ould teſtament, wee haue an ex-
Pſal.99.5. preſſe preſident of it in the new, for our Sa-
niour in the reuelation ſpeakes to the Angell
Reu.3.9. of philadelphia thus. *Behould I wil make them* (that is his enimyes) *come and worſhip before thy feet.*

Now that it may appeare, that theſe acts of worſhip, were Religious, and not meerely ciuill, wee muſt know in generall, that *worſhip is nothing but an humiliation of our ſelues in acknowledgmēt of ſome goodneſſe, and excellēcie, in that which wee worſhip.* Soe that there are two kinds of worſhip the one interiour, the other exteriour, the interiour is in the minde, and ſoul only, the exteriour is that interiour ſignifeyd by ſome humiliation of the body, ſoe that though one

may

may haue the inward of the ſoule, without any outward or exteriour in the body, yet one can neuer haue a true act of exteriour, or bodily worſhip without an interiour worſhip, in the ſoule, thus the ſouldiers in the tyme of our Sauiours paſſiō, though they bended their knees to him, which is one part of exteriour worſhip taken Separately, and abſolutely in it ſelfe, yet becauſe it was not accompanied with the inward humiliation of the ſoule, it was noe act of worſhip, but of mockerie. I ſay it followes, that as the outward corporall humiliatiou is conſtituted, an act of true worſhip, by the inward intention of the minde, Soe are the different kinds of worſhips diſtinguiſhed only by the different intentions, and humiliations of the ſoule; For the very ſame, externall comportment and proſtration of the body may be vſed both when wee worſhip God, an Angell, a Saint, an Apoſtle, a Biſhop, a Prieſt, a King, a Magiſtrate, a father, a mother, &c. thus the very ſame hebrew, and greeke word, is vſed in theſe different worſhips, (the ſame bowing and kneeling is practiſed to them all as I haue allready proued. But though the ſame externall geſtures of the body may be vſed to all, yet they beome different kinds of worſhips, according to the different humiliations, intentions, and acknowledgments, which he who worſhips deſires

Exod. 20. 4.
Gen. 49. 8.
Gen. 42. 6.
1. King. 1. 13.
2. King. 2. 15.
2. King. 4. 37.

desires to expteſſe by thoſe outward deportments of the body. Thus if when I kneele I intend to exhibite worſhip to the Creatour and maker of all tkings; that kueeling will be a diuine worſhip proper to God only; If I kneele with intention to acknowledge only ſome ciuil dignity, or morall excellency in the perſon before whom I keele, it will bc a meere ciuill worſhip, but if I kneele before, or to ſome other thing, or perſon, with intention to acknowledge in them'a worth or dignity, neyther infinite nor diuine, but finite and createed, neyther yet ciuil, morall, humane, and naturall, but chriſtian, ſpirituall, and ſupernaturall, ſuch a kneeling will neither be an act of diuine worſhip, proper to God only, nor of ciuill worſhip, proper to perſons or things indued with meare humane, and naturall, excellences. but will be an act of ſupernaturall, and religious worſhip taken in a larger ſenſe, as I ſhall preſently declare. Thus wee ſee that the different intentions of the mynde, make the ſame exteruall, kneelings of the body, to be differēt kinds of worſhips, by intending there by to acknowledge, a worth in that which is worſhipped, diuine, Supernaturall, or ciuill; ſoe that all the difficulty in this matter, conſiſts in ſhewing clearly, that there are theſe three different worths, or excellencies, to be acknowledged and honored,

nored, by an act of worſhip. Two of theſe, to witt, diuine, and ciuill excellency, the one found in God alone, the other in the ciuill Magiſtrate, all Proteſtans Acknowledge, the difficulty therefore at the laſt, comes to make it cleare, that there is allſo a third worth, and excellency, which is neyther infinite, nor increated, nor diuine, nor yet humane, or naturall, but wholy ſpirituall, and ſupernaturall, inſpired or communicated, aboue all reach, of naturall force and light, from the holy Ghoſt, and giuen to men, through the only merits, and by the authority of our Sauiour. Theſe heauenly excellencies I find to be of two ſorts the one internall, and iuſtifying graces and gifts, or at the leaſt giuen freely to men, as other ſupernaturall things: the other externall powers and authorities: both which I will conuince out of holy Scripture, to be ſuch ſupernaturall gifts of God as I haue affirmed. S. Iames, ſpeaking of the internall graces ſaith thus. *Euery beſt and perfect gift is from aboue, deſcending from the father of light.* And S. Paul *by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace was not voyd in me.* and that of our Souiour, *without me yee can doe nothing.* And S. Iohn. *Soe many as receiued him he gaue them the power to become the ſones of God, who are not born of blood, nor of the will of the fleſh, nor of the will of man but of God.* And many like texts, which

Iames 1. 17. 1. Cor. 15. v. 10. Iohn. 15. v. 5. Iohn. 1. 10.

cui-

euidently proue, that all true grace, and Sanctitie, is a free gift of God, aboue the force of mans nature, vnderstanding and will, and this Protestans commonly graunt, and noe Christian can deny, without falling in to Pelagianisme. Concerning the externall authority, dignity, and preheminencie of Ecclesiasticall persones in the true Christian church, they are as euidently ascribed to Christ, and the holy Ghost as the former. Thus S. Paul.

1. Cor. 12. v. 28. 29. *And some verily God hath set in the church, first Apostles, secondly Prophetes, thirdly Doctours, next miracles, then graces of doing cures, helps, gouernens, kinds of tongues.* Which he ascribes with many other heauenly gifts, to the holy Ghost, towards the begining of this chapter, in the words following. *And there are diuisions of graces, but the*

1. Cor. 12. 4. 5. 6. 7. 9. 10. *same spirit: And there are diuisions of ministries, but the same Lord. And there are diuisions of workes but the same God who workes all in all; But to euery one is giuen the manifestation of the spirit to profit. To one by the spirit is giuen the word of wisdome; but to another the word of knowledge according to the same spirit: to an au other faith in one spirit: to an other the worke of power, to an other Propheſie, to another discretion of spirits; to an other kinds of tongues, to an other interpretation of speeches. All these, workes one an the same spirit diuiding to euery one as he will.*

Gallath. 4. 11. 12. And to the Galathians. *And he* (that is our Saviour) *hath giuen some to be Apostles, others to*

be

be Prophets, others to be Euangelists, but others to be Pastours and Doctours, to the consummation of the Saints, into the worke of the ministry to the edifying of the body of Christ, till wee all meete in the vnity of faith, and the acknowledgment of the sone of God, in a perfect man, in the fullnesse of the age of Christ, whence it is cleare, that not only in the Apostles tyme, but through all ages till the end of the world, the dignities in the church were to be guifts of our Sauiour, and not conferred by any authority purely humane, and naturall. And as those testimonies couince, that both inward holinesse, and ecclesiasticall dignities are gifts of the holy Ghost, and conferred by the power and Authority, deriued from Christ; soe lickewise the worth and excellency of the Saints in heauen, are to be accounted the higheſt and chiefeſt supernaturall gifts, and graces of God. Thus S. Paul. *The grace of God* (Protestants reade *the gift of God*) is eternall life, *which all the Saints of heauen inioy.* And S. Iohn. *Be faithfull vntill death, and I will giue the a crowne of life.* And S. Mat. *Yee shall sit vppon twelue seates, iudging the twelue tribes of Israell.* And S. Paul. *Know you not that the Saints shal iudge the world, if the world shall be iudged by you, are you vnworthie to iudge of small matters. Know you not that wee shall iudge the Angells, how much more things of this life.* And S. Iohn, brings in the 24. Elders, saying, *thou hast made vs a kindome and Priestes and we*

Rom. 6. 23.
Rauel. 2. 10.
Mat. 19. 18.
1. Cor. 6. 2. 3. 4.
Reu. 5. 10.

ſhall reigne vppon the earth. whence moſt clearly appeares, that the Saints in heauen haue thoſe two higheſt dignities which are in eſteeme amongſt men, of Iudges, and Kings of the whole world, which notwithſtanding is aboue the power of all mortall men to confer vppon them, and only in the power of God, and therefore theſe iudiciary, and Royall powers muſt be of a higher ranck and order, then are any dignities meerely ciuill, humane, and naturall. And the like dignities are aſcribed in holy writ, to the Angells, for our Sauiour callsthem *holy Angells*, and ſoe they muſt haue ſtrne holineſſe, wihch is a gift of God aboue the force of nature. They were the *Promulgers of the ould lavv*, the *Embaſſadours* of God, in matters of higheſt concernment, the *inflicters of Gods puniſchments*, Gen. 19. 1. Reu. 15. trough out. The *captaines & generalls of the armies of God.* Ioſua 5.14. The *Gouerners & controulers of kingdomes.* Dan. 10. 12. 13. 14. The *deuiders of the Reprobate, from the elect in the day of Iudgment.* Mat. 13. 49. And *the Sendres of the wicked in to hell fier.* ibidem. with many ſuch like dignities, and preheminences, all great and high in them ſelues, and aboue the reach, both of all humane, and Angelicall nature, beſtowed freely vppon them, through the liberality of God. And as this ſupernaturall excellency is found in Saints and Angells, ſoe is it aſcribed

Luck 9. 26. Marc. 8. 36. Acts 7. 53. Gen. 19. 1. Luc. 1. 11. 1. Mat. 20.

all

all ſoe to other things in Scripture, to which God hath freely communicated certaine bleſſings and priuileges. Thus we read in Ioſua. *Looſe the ſhoes from thy feete, for the place where thou ſtandeſt is holy.* And in Exodus. *Looſe thy ſhoes from thy feete, for the place where thou ſtandeſt is holy ground.* Thus the bread of the temple, is called *holy bread*, and *ſanctifyed bread*. *The Temple* is called *holy*, yea ſoe holy, that our ſauiour ſaith, that the temple *Sanctifieth the gold*, which is in it, and the Alter *ſanctifieth the gift* which is offered vppon it Thus the moſt inward place, of the temple, had noe other name, then *Sanctam Sanctorum*, the *holy of holies*, that is the moſt holy place of the whole world. The holineſſe of theſe, and the like things, where in ſoeuer it conſiſted, iſſued not from any ciuill, or humane power, but was drawne from the power, and authority of God, as authour of the true Sauing religion of thoſe times. Thus I haue made it cleare out of Scripture, that there is a worth, a dignity, a power, an excellency, which is meerely created, and infinitely inferiour, to the attributes, and perfections of God, and yet far excelling all ciuill, and humane worth, and aboue the reatch, ſphere, and force of all ciuill power and authority. The moſt cleare rule, to the capacity of the vulgar, to diſtinguiſh, ciuill, worths and excellencies, from Spi-

Ioſua 5. 16. Exod. 3. 5. 1 King 21. 4. 6. Pſal. 5. 8. Pſ. 10. 4. Pſ. 17. 7. Mat. 23. 17. 18. 19. Exod. Leuit. Numbers &c.

rituall and ſupernaturall, is, that thoſe which are common to the true religion, with all other kinds and profeſſions of men, are only ciuill and naturall, ſuch as are, wit, vnderſtanding, knowledge, learning, eloquence, nobility, valour, Gouernment, Magiſtracy, &c. But thoſe which are proper to the true religion, are Spirituall, and Supernaturall, as are, the dignity of a Saint in heauen, of an Angell, a holy man yet liuing, a Prophet, an Appoſtle, a Biſhop, a Prieſt, a Godfather, a God mother, &c. And becauſe theſe and the like *excellencies*, are proper *to religion*, they may in a large ſence, be termed *religious excellencies, or dignities*. That this may be better vnderſtood, the Reader, may take notice, that the word *Religion*, may eyther be taken in a ſtrict ſenſe, for the vertue of Religion, as it is diſtingniſhed, from othet infuſed, and ſupernaturall vertues, *whereby true worſhip and honour is giuen to God*: or in a more large and generall ſence, for the whole profeſſion of thoſe who eſteeme them ſelues to haue the true ſauing way of ſeruing God, and attaining Saluation. Aud this is the more obuious, and vulgar vnderſtanding of this word *Religion*, thus we commonly ſay the Catholicque *Religion*, &c. that is theyr whole beleefe, and profeſſion. In the firſt ſtrict and and rigid ſenſe, *Religion* is taken amongſt the Schoole doctours, when they diſpute of the

nature

nature of infuſed vertues: and in the like ſenſe it is often taken in the bookes of Moyſes, Exod. 12. 26. 43. Exod. 29. 9. Leuit. 26. 31. n. 19. 2. where it is reſtrayned eyther to ſacrifice, or or ſome other worſhrp of God. In the Second more large acception, it is fouud, both in the old and new teſtament. Heſter 8. 17. *Soe that many of an other nation and ſect, ioyned them ſelues to theyr Religion and ceremonies.* Heſter 9. 27. *Vppon all thoſe who would vnite them ſelues to theyr Religion.* Acts 26. 3. Saint Paul ſaith, that before his conuerſion, *Hee liued a Phareſie according to the moſt certaine ſect of his Religion.* Iames c. 2. *If any one ſeeme to be religious and bridleth not his tongue, this mans religion is vaine.* In which texts it is manifeſt that *Religion* is taken for the whole beleefe, and Profeſſion, both of Iewes and Chriſtians. Hence it follows, that as the word *Religion*, ſoe the word *Religious*, deriued from it, may be taken in the two fore ſaid differēte ſenſes; yet I find it vſually in Scripture in the ſecōd larger acception, where a Religious Perſone ſignifies nothing, but a perſon truly deuout, vertuous, and faithfull. Thus Acts 2. 5. *But there vvere dvvelling in Ieruſalem Ievves Religious men of all nations vvhich are vnder heauen.* And Acts 10. 2. where it is ſaid of Cornelius, *that he vvas Religious, and fearing God vvith his vvhole houſhould, giuing many almes to the common people, and all vvayes praying God.* And Acts 13. 50.

Num. 19. 2.

Θρησκος, Religious, *pious, according to Scapula.* Deuout *in the proteſtant Bibles.* Εὐλαβὴς, *According to Scapula, amongſt Eccleſiaſticall Authores,* Religious, Pious, *the proteſtants tranſlate it* Deuout.

The Iewes stirred vp certaine Religious, and honest woemen, and the chiefe of the citty, &c. And Iames the 1.26. *If any man seeme to himselfe to be Religious, not bridling his tongue this mans Religion is vaine* where *Religious*, is taken for pious, vertuous &c. For ells the ill gouernment of the tongue, would not hinder a true exercise of the vertue of religion, strictly vnderstood as it differs from other theologicall and morall vertues, as it hinders not the true exercise of faith and hope; as they are particular vertues. This large acception therefore of these words *Religion*, and *Religious*, being soe clearely deliuered in Scripture It will be sufficient for defence of the Catholique Romaine faith in this point, to affirme, that when our Doctours say that any thing created may be or is, worshipped with *Religious worship*, that it is Religious in this large acception found soe familiarly in Scripture, that is, vertuous, pious, christian, a worship belonging to our Religion, proper to our Religion, and tending finally to the acknowledgment of God, and our Sauiours honour, as authour of our faith and Religion. Soe that hauing these references to Gods honour, though those Acts of *Religious worship* tend immediately to the acknowledgement of some created supernaiurall excellence in that which wee worshipp, by them, yet that hinders not theyr beeing Religious acts

Θρησκος. Religious in protestat Bibles.

in

in this larger ſence. As appeares by theſe following texts of Scripture; where Moyſes is commaunded to preſcribe certaine ceremoniall rites in Sacrifices,& Holocauſts,amongſt which one was,that the breſt & right Shoulder of that which was offered in ſacrifice, ſhould be giuen to the Prieſts, as belonging to them by right and ordinance of God, The giuing of theſe two parts of the thing offered to the prieſt,was an action done immediately to a pure creature,and not to God, and yet it is called Religion, as appeares by the words. Theſe things *God commaunded to be giuen to them* (that is to Aaron, and his offſpring, as it is in the precedent words,) *from the children of Iſraell, by a perpetuall Religion in theyr generations.* Leuit.7. 6.

Secondly S. Iames. *Pure and vndefiled Religion with God,and the father is this,to viſite the orphanes, and widowes in theyr tribulation, and to keepe himſelfe vnſpotted in this life,* where a worke of mercy to the pore is called *Religion*, that is a worke proceeding from Religion, and belongrg to Religion,though done to creatures,ſuch as are orphanes and wedows. Iames 1. 17.

All that I haue cited out of Scripture in the diſcouery of this ſecond miſtake,will,I hope, haue cõuinced the iudicious,and well minded Reader, that there is a Supernaturall created excellency, communicated liberally from Allm:God to ſome creatures, infinitely below

the diuine, excellency of God, and yet far aboue all naturall and ciuill worth, which therefore must deserue honour, and worship seeing that naturall and ciuill excellencies, (euen according to protestants) though far inferiour to them, deserue it. which worship seeing it is done in acknowledgment of the Spirituall and supernaturall dignities, which are only proper to Gods true religion, and soe are religious excellencies, may be rightly termed a religious worship in the fore named sense: For seeing the humble acknowledgmēt of diuine perfections, is deseruedly termed *diuine worship*, and of ciuill, perfections, rightly styled, *ciuill worship* soe the humble acknowledgment of religious perfections, for the like reason, is to be named Religious worship, which will yet seeme lesse strange, to an indifferēt eye if one consider, that the same different degrees may be found in Acts of other vertues, which are here foūd in worships, I haue allready proued from Scripture that there are different kinds and degrees of feares, and loues. whence it followes, that when one feares the iustice and wrath of some ciuill Prince, or magistrate, it may be called *ciuill feare*, but when one feares the iustice and authority of an Apostle, a Prophet, &c. whose power is drawn from Religion, it may be named a *Religious feare*. Thus the feare of Adam, hiding him

Gen. 3. 10.

himselfe from God, was a *diuine feare.* The feare of Adonias flying from king Salomon, was a ciuill feare: but the feare of the Primitiue Christians of S. Peeter, when Ananias fel down dead at his feete, was a *Religious feare.* And the same distinction is in differēt ordres of loue. S. Peeter loued our Sauiour as his God and Redeemer, with diuine loue. Ifack loued Esau, with a *ciuill loue*; but the Primitiue Christians loued S. Paul, with a *Religious loue.* And in the same manner, as I haue allready Proued, Moyses worshipped the infinit maiesty of God, with a *diuiue worship*, the children of Iacob worshipped the power and excellency of Ioseph, with a *ciuill worship*, but the Sunamite worshipped Elizeus, and the captaine of fifty men, Elias, (whose authorities were deriued, known, and acknowledged only from faith, and Religion) with Religious worship.

1 Kings 1. Acts. Acts 5. 6. Iohn. 21. 17. Gen. 25. 28. Acts 10. 37.

And the giuing such a Religious worship as this, which I haue described to a creature is soe far from derogating any thing from the due worship of God, or from ascribing any worship proper to him, to any creature, that it would be an insufferable iniury to God, And horrid Sacriledge, to affirme that he is to be worshipped, with any such worship for that were to acknowledge in him only a created, finite, & imperfect excellencie, which were

to make him an Idoll,& a falſe God. Neyther can his honour be any thing diminiſhed by exhibiting this kinde of Religious worſhip, to a creature indued with ſpitituall graces, for his honour cannot be iniured, but by giuing to a creature the worſhip proper, and due to him only, ſeeing therefore this is no worſhip due to him neyther only nor at all, it cannot be any way a preiudice to his honour. For as ciuill and religious feare, and loue commanded to be giuen to creatures, is no way preiudicious to the diuine feare and loue which we owe to God; Soe neyther can ciuill, nor religious worſhip commaunded to be exhibited to creatures, (as I haue proued) be preiudicious to the higheſt diuine worſhip which we owe to God. And thus much Allm: God ſeemes
Iſay 42.8. to ſay by his Ptophet Iſay, *I am the Lord this is my name, I will not giue my glory to any other, nor my praiſe to Idols.* where he ſaith not, *I will not giue glory to any other*, for that would be contrary to the words of the Pſalmiſt,
Pſal.8.6. ſpeaking of man in his firſt creation, *Thou haſt crowned him with glory and honour*, but I will not giue *my glory* to an other, that is that infinite glory which properly belongs to God only, wich is ſpecifyed in the precedent words, *I am the Lord, this in my name*, ſoe that God wil neuer giue that which is his proper name and title, *to be Lord of all things*, to an other; which is

yet

yet more expreſſely ſet down, by the ſame Prophet, *And I will uot giue my glory to an other: heare o Iacob and Iſraell whom I call. I, I my ſelfe am the firſt, and I am the laſt. And my hand alſo layd the foundarions of the earth, and my right hand meaſured the heauens*, &c. This is that glory proper to him alone, of being the eternall God, creator of heauen and earth, which he will not giue to an other: which ſoe long as he keepes inuiolable to him ſelfe, all vnder glories limited and created, which are like ſoe many little motes compared with the infinite extent, and light of his glory, he both liberally giues himſelfe, and wills they ſhould reſpectiuely be giuen to his creatures. If not withſtanding all theſe euidences both of Scripture and Reaſon, any one ſhould remayne ſoe ſtrangely willfull, and immouable, by force of education, and continuall cuſtome from his infancie, as to deny all kind of Religious worſhip in how large a ſence ſoeuer it be taken, to be lawfully exhibited to any ſaue God alone. I ſay if any ſuch ſhould be found; ſoe long as he yeelds to the thing it ſelfe, that is, to exhibite reuerence, and worſhip to perſons, and things in acknowledgement of the ſupernaturall, and free gifts, graces, and bleſſinges of God, where with they are inriched. (as I haue ſhewed many holy perſons mentioned in the Scriptures, haue done) let him

Iſay 48. 11. 12. 13.

call

call that worſhip ſupernaturall, or chriſtian, or pious, or an exterordinary ranke of ciuill worſhip, I ſhall not much contend about rhe name, when the thing is done. For what ſoeuer he call it, it is, and cannot but be, a Religious worſhip in it ſelfe, at leaſt in that large ſenſe, ſoe clearely drawn from the Scriptures. And Thus much of the diſcouery & redreſſe of the ſecond miſtake.

THE THIRD MISTAKE.

The vvord ſerue *in Mat.*4.10. *is miſunderſtood.*

THe opponent indeuoring to proue that *God, only is to be worſhipped, and therefore neyther S.nor Angell,* from the text of Mat.4.10. *Thou ſhalt worſhipp the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerue.* Seeing there is noe proofe in the former part of the text, as I haue ſhewed, muſt haue recourſe to the latter, *and him only ſhalt thou Serue*, and that this clauſe may haue any appearance of force it muſt ſuppoſe, that the word *Serue* here vſed, ſignifies all kind of Seruice; Soe that theſe words, and *him only ſhalt thou Serue*, muſt ſignify thus much *that noe ſeruice muſt be doue but to God alone.* which muſt needs be a very groſſe miſtake, for the word *Seruice* taken in this generall ſence, playnly contra-

contradicts the Precept of S.Paul. *Obey your temporall Lords,&c. Seruing them with a good will, as to our Lord, and not to men.* And that Propheſie in Geneſis of Iacob, and Eſau. *The greater ſhall ſerue the Leſſe.* Soe that it is manifeſt, that not God only is to be ſerued. Whence may breefely be noted, that before one cite any text of Scripture, for the proofe of any thing, one muſt firſt cõſider, whether the ſence in which that text muſt be taken to be of force to proue what we intend, contradict not other playne places of Scripture, as this does, which if it doe, we muſt ſeeke ſome other proofe, for that will not be a proofe, but a miſtake. But the miſtake in this place of Mat.4.10. proceedes not only from want of reflection vppon other places of Scripture, but from want of knowledge of the greeke word vſed here by the Euãgeliſt. For though both in Engliſh, Latin and Hebrew, there be only one word to ſignifie the ſeruing of God, and creatures. Yet in the greeke there is a proper word, which ſignifies only the ſeruice, of God, or proper to him alone, and is neuer vſed for the religious ſeruice done to any creature, as a creature, but as eſteemed by thoſe, whoe exhibite that ſeruice to be a *God.* This word in greeke is λατρεύειν, latreuin, vſed by the holy Ghoſt in this place, Mat.4 10. to ſignifie *ſerue.* That this may be vnderſtood, the Reader may

Epheſ.6. 7.

Gen.25. 21. Rom.9. 12.

may pleaſe to note, that many words haue two kinds of ſignifications, the one by force of theyr firſt inſtitution; which they anciently had, and haue amongſt heathen Authours; the other by vſe and application, to ſome one particular Sence, by vertue of common vſe and cuſtome, which hath in proceſſe of tyme obtayned force, to limite them to that perticular Senſe. Thus the word τυραννος, tyrannos, amongſt the ancient Greekes firſt ſignifyed a king, and was taken in a good Sence, but amongſt later Authours, and now vniuerſally it ſignifies a Tyrant, or cruell, and vniuſt oppreſſer, of ſuch as are vnder him.

And as the vnanimous conſent of approued Authours, and common wealths, hath a power to giue a new ſignification to words, or rather to limite or reſtrayne the ould, to ſome determinate parte of what they ſignifyed, by force of theyr firſt inſtitution, ſoe hath allſoe the vniuerſall conſent of eccleſiaſticall approued Authours, and the common voyce of Chriſtendome, the like power, ſoe to alter the ancient ſignification of ſome words, that it determines the indifferency, and vniuerſality of theyr originall Signification to ſome one part or member of it, when they apply it to expreſſe ſomething in Chriſtian Religion. Thus βάπτισμος, Baptiſmus, which anciently ſignifyed any kind of

waſhing

washing amongst ecclesiasticall, and Christian Authours, is taken for a Sacramēt, known by that name. Thus *Euangelist*, which originally signifeyed any one who told good tydinges, siguifies a wryter or promulger of the Gospell. In the like manner λατρεύειν, which signifyed amongst the auncient infidels, any kind of seruice, amongst Eccleſiasticall Authours, signifies only that kinde of Religious seruice, which is don to God. Soe that it hath two significations, the one morall, the other Ecclesiasticall, as Scapula a Protestant authour, of our nation acknowledges in his Lexicon both of this, and the former, and many other words, graunting that according to the Sence, which it hath amongst Ecclesiasticall authours, and in the new Testament, it signifies a Religious worship only, and in proofe of this, cites the epistle to the Hebrewes, where beeing put absolutely it signifies the worship of God. This dubble signification supposed, I Hebr. 9. 9.
vrge further that this word λατρεύειν, Latreuin, in the Scripture, signifies that Religious worship only which is exhibited to God, or diuine worship, and is neuer vsed through the whole Scripture, for a religious Seruice done to any creature, as to a creature, I haue bestowed some dayes study, to examine this matter, and hauing searched all the places of Sctipture where this word λατρεύειν is, I neuer found

found it signify any religious seruice saue diuine, and I Prouocke any Protestant authour to proue the contrarie.

True it is that δουλέυειν douleuin, is indifferently vsed very commonly in both Testaments, to signify the religious seruing of God, or creatures; λατρέυειν Latreuin, neuer but for seruing, eyther a true, or false God. when it is referred to worship blonging to Religion. And though Scapula being a Protestant only say, that this word λατρέυειν signifies a religious worship, yet the proofe which he bringes for it out of the epistle to the Hebrews conuinces that being absolutely put, that is alone without any oblique case, it signifyes, as he acknowledges, the Seruice done to God only. Τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρέυοντα, *perfectum facere seruientem*, that could not make him that *did the seruice perfect*. And he might alsoe haue cited the same word put absolutely, and signifying only the seruice of God, in S. Luke, where he sayth Anna the Propheteisse was night and day in the Temple. λατρέυουσα, seruing, that is doing seruice to God. This text, Luke the 2.37. The Protestant bible of 1589. with Fulks commentarie translates λατρόυουσα, *Serued God*. And Heb. 9.2. λατρεία, seruings of God, and the later Bibles translate it, *diuine seruice* whence it appeares that the absolute significarion of this word, is the seruice of God, or diuine seruice.

Heb. 9. 9.

Luc. 2. 37.

In

In the like manner I find it, Acts 7.7. Rom. 1.9. and Reuel. 22. taken for the ſeruice of the true God, and for the ſeruice of Idoles, or falſe Gods. Acts 7. v. 41. 1. Cor. 5. 1. and Rom. 22. 15. & in the old Teſtamẽt very often. From this ground proceeds the ordinary diſtinction of Religious worſhip, into λατρεία, Latria, and δουλεία, doulia, for ſeeing that λατρεύω, Latreuo, ſignifyes noe other Religious Seruice, ſaue that which is due to God, through the whole Scripture, and δουλεύω, douleuo, ſignifyes in hundreds of places, as well that which is due to God, as to creatures, hence the ſeruice done to finit Perſons, belonging to Religion may rightly be termed *doulia*, and that which is exhibited to God alone, Latria, and hence it proceeds alſoe, that the ſeruice of falſe Gods or Idoles, is neuer called eyther in Scripture, nor in approued Eccleſiaſticall Authours, noe nor by Proteſtants themſelues, *Idolodoulia*, but Idololatria, Idolatrie becauſe it giues to them diuine ſeruice due to God only, being deriued from Larria, which ſignifies noe other Religious ſeruice ſaue diuine. Seeing therefore noe Romaine Catholique teaches, that diuine ſeruice due to God only is to be giuen to any creature, but the quite contrary they hould nothing againſt this text of S. Mat. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerue*, λατρεύεις, that

is with the ſeruice of Latria, or higheſt degree of Seruice, which (as I haue demonſtrated) by Scripture is due to God only.

Thus haue I diſcouered three plaine miſtakes in theſe few words of Mat. 4. 10. to proue that *God only is to be worſhipped*, where in I haue beene forced to be more large, then I wiſhed, becauſe vppon what I haue here deliuered, depends the clearing of the inſuing controuerſies, in this matter of worſhip.

The ſecond Proteſtant Poſition,

Forbidden the worſhip of Angells.

This is proued by Scripture miſtaken.

Reuel. 22. v. 8. 9. *I Iohn ſaw all theſe thinges and heard them, and when I had heard and ſeene, I fell downe to worſhip, before the feete of the Angell, wich ſhewed me theſe things: then ſaid he vnto me, ſee thou doe it not, for I am thy fellow ſeruant, worſhip God.*

The firſt miſtake:

This text is made contrary to other playne texts of Scripture, allowing the worſhp of Angells.

Gen. 19. v. 1. *AND two Angells came into Sodome at night, Lot ſitting at the gates of the citty: who, when he had ſeene them, roſe and went to meete them, and he adored*

adored proſtrate vppon the groũd, &c. which worſhip the Angells accepted, noe way reprehending Lot, or forbidding him, as appeares in the text. *And when Ioſua was in the feeld of Hierico, he liſt vp his eyes, and ſaw a man ſtanding againſt him, honlding a naked ſword: and he went vnto him and ſayd, art thou ours, or our aduerſaryes? who anſweared, no; but I am a prince of the army of our Lord, and and now I come: Ioſua fell groueling vppon the ground and adoring ſayd, wy doth my Lord ſpeake vnto his ſeruant?* &c. where it appeares that this Angel was a creature, and not God, for he is called *a prince*, That is one of the Princes of Gods army. Ioſua 5. v. 14.

The ſecond miſtake.

THis text of S. Iohn proues noe more that all worſhip of Angells is forbidden, then an other of S. Luke that the worſhip of Saints yet liuing is forbidden:

As Peeter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell downe at is feet and worſhipped him. But Peeter tooke him vp ſaying, ſtand vp, I my ſelfe alſoe am a man. And yet it is cleare out of Scripture, that holy men yet liuing are to be worſhipped, and haue accepted of the worſhip, of others. *Againe he ſent a third captaine of fifty men, and fifty men with him; who, when he was come, bowed his knees tovvard Elias, and prayed him and ſaid man of God deſpiſe not* Act. 10. v. 25. 26. 2 Kings 4. v. 37.

my life and the liues of thy seruants that are vvith me, &c. *She* (that is, the Sunamite) *fell at his feete, and adored vppon the groond.* where we see that
4. Kings 4. v. 37. the Prophete Eliseus was worshipped and he refused it not. And it is the common practice of Protestants in Engeland to kneele downe and aske blessing of theyr Godfathers and Godmothers, desiring them to pray for them to God; which is a true worship, and yet it is noe ciuill worship, because the reason why they doe it, belonges not to any dignity in the common wealth, but to Religion; and therefore it must be a worship appertaining to Religion, as was the worship of Elias and Eliseus now cited, which is the wery same with that worship, which by Romain Catholickes is giuen to Saints and Angells, as creatures, belonging to faith, and Religion.

The third mistake.

ONe may proue as well, that it is vnlawful to weepe, as ro wurship Angells, beecause an Angell forbad S. Iohn toweepe.

Reu. 5. 4. 5. *And I wept much because noe man was found worthy to open and to read the booke, neyther to looke therein, And one of the Elders said vnto me weepe uot.* And yet certainly it is lawfull to weepe, for if it weare not, neyther our Sauiour would
Luc. 23. 28 haue wept ouer Hierusalem, nor commaunded

the woemen of Hieruſalem, to weepe ouer themſelues,&c.

The text of S.Iohn, Reuel.22.v.8.v.8.ad 9. reconciled with the other texts of Scripture.

IF any one would proue out of the 10.of the Acts,v.25. and 26. now cited, that noe Apoſtle,or ſaint yet liuing, were to be worſhipped, becauſe S.Peeter refuſed the worſhip which Cornelius exhibited to him, I demaund, what would a Proteſtant anſwer to ſuch an obiection. Eyther he muſt ſay that S.Peeter refuſed this worſhep (though he might laufully haue accepted it.as beeing due, no leſſe then the like worſhip was accepted by Elias,and Eliſeus) that S.Peeter,I ſay notwithſtanding,Refuſed it out of humility and reſpect,which he bare to Cornelius: and this ſuppoſed, Proteſtants muſt giue vs leaue to apply (with the greateſt part of the ancient Fathers and Doctours) the ſame anſwer to S.Iohn's worſhipping the Angell, and his refuſing it;for ſome worſhip was noe leſſe due to this Angell then it was to the two Angells, which Lot worſhipped. Gen.19.v.1. and the Angell which Ioſua worſhipped,Ioſua 5.v.14. now cited: and yet this Angell refuſed it out of humility and reſpect, which he bore to S.Iohn,as S.Peeter did,Acts 10.v.25.and 26.

or if this anſwer ſeeme, not ſoe conuenient to this plare of the Acts, a Proteſtāt muſt anſwer, that Cornelius here gaue him the worſhip which was due to God only, that is, the higheſt diuine worſhip, which he therefore refuſed as iniurious to God noe otherwiſe then S. Paul and Barnabas with all earneſtneſſe poſſible, refuſed the ſacrifice which the heathen Prieſt of Lyſtra would haue offered to them, as to two Gods, Iupiter and Mercurius, whom they tooke them to be. And if they like of this anſwer, they will giue vs alſoe leaue to apply the ſame to the paſſage of S. Iohn. Reu. 22. v. 8. 9. not that S. Iohn committed any Idolatry or falſe worſhip, willingly and ſinfully, but that the Angell vppon good ground eyther thought, or at leaſt feared, that S. Iohn tooke him to be our Sauiour, & ſoe gaue him preſently the worſhip due to the Diuine Perſon which he thought him to be: for though it be wholly improbable, that Cornelius gaue diuine worſhip to S. Peeter Act. 10. becauſe he was noe heathen, but a true beleeuer, and ſoe knew that diuine honour, was to be giuen to God only; and religious and fearing God, as appeares, v. 11. and ſoe was far from cōmitting Idolatry, and knew well enough that S. Peeter was a man, v. 5. and the 6. and ſoe could not ſuppoſe him, out of ignorance to be God, and though it ſeeme as improbable, that S. Peeter con-

Act. 14. v. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14.

conceiued that Cornelius intended to worſhip him with diuine honour, ſeeing he was ſufficiently informed, that he was a true beleeuer, and Profeſſour of the law of Moiſes, v.22. yet many ancient fathers teach that S.Iohn did really thinke that this Angell which appeared to him, was not an Angell, but our Sauiour; or at leaſt it was very incident to the Angel, to conceiue or feare (being ignorant of S.Iohns intention) that he tooke him to be our Sauiuor, becauſe the Angel ſayd in the precedēt verſe *behould I come quickly*, which was the vſuall phraſe & ſpeech which our Sauiour vſed to S. Iohn when he appeared to him, as is manifeſt chap.2.v.6. chap.3.v.21. c.16.v.15. c.22.v.12. and muſt neceſſarily haue beene pronounced, eyther by our Sauiour himſelfe, or by an Angell in his place, and ſpeaking in his name, becauſe theſe words, *I come quickly* (as is cleare in all the afore cited places, and particularly chap.22.v.12. preſently following) can neyther be meant nor verifyed of any one but of our Sauiour: and this to haue been the opinion of S.Iohn, by reaſon of thoſe next precedent words, Behold *I come quicly*, may haue ſome ground in the text it ſelfe here cited by the opponent, *And when I had heard and ſeene, I fell down to worſhip*, &c. for the ſeeing of thoſe ſtrange viſions, and hearing thoſe precedent words. Behold *I come quicly*. Soe proper to

out Sauiour, gaue this occaſion to worſhip the Angel, as taking him to be our Sauiour: and therefore the Angel preſently diſabuſed him, and let him vnderſtand that he was not our Sauiour, but a creature and ſeruant of God, as appeares in this text obiected v.8. and 9. if it ſhould be obiected that c.21. v.9. S. Iohn affirmes, that this very Angell which he worſhipped was one of the ſeauen Angells, who caried the viols filled with the laſt plagues, and therefore could not thinke that it was our Sauiour. I anſwer that though in the begining and continnance of this viſion he ſeemed to him to be an Angell, yet when he heard him pronounce words proper to our Sauiour, he might haue ſufficient reaſon to thinke that his former apprehenſion was amiſſe, and that whatſoeuer he ſeemed before, yet it was our Sauiour appearing vnder the forme of that Angell. If it be further obiected that S. Iohn writes expreſly that it was one of the Seauen Angells, which appeared to him, and therefore could not after doubt of it, it may be anſweared that when the Euangeliſt writ this he was wholy aſſured that it was an Angell, becauſe the Angell had, before this was written, determinaetly aſſured him, that he was not our Sauiuor; yet whilſt the viſion happned, before it was eyther written, or the Angell had rectifyed the iudgment of

S. Iohn,

S. Iohn, he had ground inough to thinke it was our Sauiour, when he heard thoſe words proceede from him, *behould I come ſpeedily.* Neyther is it any wonder that S. Iohn was ignorant of ſome things, concerning the viſions which appeared to him. For he thought that none could be found worthie to open the ſeauen ſeales and therefore wept, and was as much forbidden to weepe by the Angell, c.5.v.4. as to worſhip, c.19.v.10. Hee acknowledges alſoe that hee knew not who they weare who appeared in white Stoles. c.7.v.13.

Though theſe anſweares may ſatisfye all that is oppoſed againſt them, yet becauſe the matter is in it ſelfe obſcure, and leaues a probability on both ſides, I rather ſticke to the other anſwer that though S. Iohn knew it was noe more then an Angell, yet the Angell refuſed the worſhip he gaue him, at S. Peeter did that of Cornelius. Aud yet whatſoeuer may be thought of theſe two anſwers, that which is moſt cleare and vnqueſtionable is a third anſwers. That though S. Iohn knew that he who ſpeake to him was an Angel, and not our Sauiour, and ſoe gaue him, the worſhip only due to an Angel, yet the Angel being ignorant of S. Iohns intention, might diſeruedly feare, or conceiue, that he tooke him to be our Sauiour, and ſoe gaue him diuine worſhip, and therefore, he preſently

disſabuſed him, telling him that he was one of his fellow ſeruants, &c. And each of theſe anſwers may be equally applyed to the like
Reu.22. text, Reuel.19. for out of the ſame ground of
v.9.9. Act 10. it may be ſayd that he refuſed this
Reu.19. worſhip though in it ſelfe lawfull, as S. Peeter did that of Cornelius: or that he ſuppoſed him to be our Sauiour, (and ſoe gaue him diuine honour which was no way due to him) becauſe he there vſed the phraſe of our Sauiour, when he ſayd *ſcribe*, write, as appeares in the three firſt chapters, and chap. 14. v. 13. 14. 15. neyther can it be clearly proued that any one commaunded S. Iohn to write, ſaying to him, *Scribe*, write, but our Sauiour, ſaue only in this place, through the whole Reuelation; and then it was ſpoken in the name and perſon of Chriſt by the Angell; ſoe that S. Iohn had great reaſon to thinke that it was the voyce of our Sauiour, and therefore gaue him the honour due to our Sauiour, till he was better informed: or according to the third, and cleareſt auſwer, the Angel had reaſon to thinke, that S. Iohn worſhipped him, (when he heard him vſe that phraſe of our Sauiour) with diuine worſhip, as taking him to be our Sauiour, though S. Iohn, knew that he was but an Angel, and ſoe gaue him only the worſhip which was due to an Angel. And thus much for the text of S. Iohn.

The

The text of S. Paul miſtaken.

Againſt the worſhipping of Angels.

Let no man beguile you of your reward in voluntary humility, and worſhipping of Angells, intruding into thoſe thinges, which he hath not ſeene, vainly puffed vp in his fleſhly minde. Coloſſ. 2. v. 18.

The Firſt miſtake.

The vvorſhipping of Angells miſſapplyed.

I Anſwer, that this text ſpeakes of a worſhiping of Angells, wherby they are made equall to Chriſt, or that Chriſt is depending of them, which containes plaine Infidelity, and blaſphemy againſt our Sauiour. Now that this is ſo, appeares euidētly, firſt out of the text it ſelfe if it had been wholy cited; for it followes immediately v. 18. in your owne Bible, *and not holding the head by which all the body by ioynts and bands hauing nouriſhment miniſtred, and knit together, increaſeth with the increaſe of God.* Which is nothing but ſo to worſhip Angells, that they deny the ſouerainty of Chriſt, and acknowledge him not to be the chiefe nouriſhing head of the church; which all Romain Catho-

Catholikes condemne as mainly iniurious to Chriſt, and deſtructiue of the church, becauſe it takes a way his diuinity, and exhibites worſhip to the Angells, not as Chriſts ſeruants, and vaſſalls infinitly inferiour to him, and on whom he hath no dependance at all, but as to his equalls, or Superiours.

But Romain Catholikes not denying Chriſt's abſolute ſouerainty and Diuinity, but moſt conſtantly beleeuing it, euen whilſt they worſhip Angells as his ſeruants, doe not any thing againſt this text of S. Paul. Coloſſ. 2. v. 18. and 19. wherin is forbidden only ſuch a worſhip of them as deſtroyes the beleefe that he is the Soueraine head of his church, *worſhipping of Angells*, &c. v. 18. *not holding the head*, &c. v. 19.

The Second miſtaken.

The greeke word θρησκεία is miſtranſlated.

SEcondly, that not all honour and worſhip of Angells is forbidden in this text, but only ſuch as deſtroyes the Souerainty and Diuinity of Chriſt, may be gathered out of the greeke word here vſed by the Apoſtle, *threſkeia*, which (as Scapula a Proteſtant in his lexicon notes) hath for the firſt ſignification, *Religion*, and ſo the vulgar latin tranſlates it *Reli-*

Coll. 2. v. 18.

Religionem Angelorum, the Religion of Angells; which intimates thus much, that thoſe againſt whom the Apoſtle here writes, did compoſe out of theyr own heads, a religion of Angells, whom they had neuer ſeene, nor did they vnderſtand, as the Apoſtle ſignifies in theſe words v. 18. *intruding into thoſe things which they haue not ſeene*; and fayning vnto them ſelues certaine ſubordinations and dependences amongſt the Angells, and making our Sauiour, a mere Angell as the reſt, and not God. And ſo framing theyr whole faith and religion in Angells, that it might iuſtly be termed by the Apoſtle θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων, *threſkeia ton Angelon, the religion of Angells*. And had your Proteſtant tranſlations beene ſo punctuall and faithfull in giuing the full ſignification of the greeke text as you imagine, they ſhould rather haue tranſlated the greeke word Threſkeia (according to the prime and firſt ſignification) *religion*, then according to a ſecondary ſignification, *worſhipping*: but they choſe this rather then the former becauſe it ſounds in the eares of the vnlearned, more againſt the doctrine an practiſe of the Romain Church, who are carried away much more by the words then the ſenſe of Scripture, which the vnlearned and vnſtable peruert to theyr owne deſtruction 1. of Peetet, the 3. v. 16. and this is the ordinary deceit of your new tranſlatours, Col. 2. v. 18.

in

in very many other places of holy Scripture, when the greeke or hebrew words haue different significations, allwayes to put that which makes moſt againſt vs, leauing the reſt; which notwithſtanding they put when the other ſerue theyr turnes better againſt vs, though the greeke word be the ſame; which I am able to demonſtrate if it be demanded: the tranſlation of the word Threſkeia ſhall now ſuffice: for though they tranſlate it here *worſhipping*, becauſe that word ſeemed to be of force amongſt the ignorant readers, againſt vs, yet Iames 1. v. 26. and 27. they tranſlate the very ſame word *threſkeia* here vſed, *religion*, not *worſhipping*, or *worſhip*: *this mans religion is vaine* v. 26. pure religion &c. v. 27. becauſe there it was no aduantage. for them, nor diſaduantage to vs, to tranſlate it *Religion*: but howſoeuer when ſuch texts as theſe are vſed againſt vs, Proteſtants muſt not thinke that we are bound to ſtand to theyr tranſlation which we allow not of, but to the hebrew, greeke, or Latin, (with proportion:) and ſo when the words in thoſe languages haue different ſignifications, we are not bound to anſwer to the text as it ſtands in theyr new tranſlations, but haue freedome to take the word in ſome other ſignification, eſpecially when antiquity hath ſoe tranſlated and onderſtood it: & therefore I anſwer here that the greeke word hauing diffe-

different ſignifications, it is not the *worſhipping*, but the *religion* of Angells, which is here forbidden; for ſoe the vulgar tranſlation hath it, which is ancient about twelue hundred yeares: and how can any Proteſtant, though learned, euer conuince out of Scripture, that the word *threſkeia*, is rather to be tranſlated *worſhipping*, then *religion*? ſeeing the greeke word ſignifies both, and the ſcope and context of the Apoſtle rather agrees with *religion* then *worſhipping*; nay how ſhall the poore vnlearned readers be certaine that their tranſlation is the word of God, and the true and only ſignification of the word in the originall in that place, when the originall word hath ſundry ſignifications? and further, how ſhall they not haue cauſe to doubt of, and call in queſtion the whole tranſlation of the bible? ſeeing they know not when the words in the originall haue different ſignifications, or only one, and ſo may doubt wether the true ſignification, and that which is only meant there by the holy Ghoſt, is put, or rather an other which was not intended by the holy Ghoſt in that place, eſpecially in places of controuerſy, where their Tranſlatours vſe to take all aduantages againſt vs, as I haue ſhewed: And yet neyther of thoſe two inconueniences toutch Romain Catholikes, becauſe their tranſlation is commended and approued by

the

the holy church, which thy beleeue cannot erre in her definitions in poynts of faith; and so rest assured that their translation deliuereth the true signification of the words meant by the holy Ghost in each particular place, though the words in themselues be indifferent to many significations in the originall.

Now it appeares euidently, that S. Paul speakes of a Religion (or as the Protestants will haue it, *a worshipping*) of Angells, which makes them equall to Christ, or Christ dependant of them, because the streame of holy ancient fathers affirme that the Apostle wrote here against Symon Magus,[a] and other Archheretikes in the Apostles time, who coyned these errours of the Angells, forging certaine subordinations, dependences, and preeminencyes amongst them, that our Sauiour was one of them, & (as some[b] thought) subiect to them. The ancient Fathers, who affirme that the aboue said heretikes held these errours about the Angells, are Clemens Romanus, who liued in the tyme of the Apostles, lib. 6. Constitut. c. 10. S. Ireneus, who liued in the next age after the Apostles, lib. 2. against hereseys &c. S. Epiphanius, who florished about 300. yeares after Christ, in his Catalogue of hereseyes, speaking of Symon Magus and the rest: and Theodoret, who wrote about 400. yeares after our Sauiour, witnesses that the holy Apostle S. Paul

[a] *Menander, Saturninus, Cethiani, Caiani.*

[b] *Cerinthiani.*

in

in this place writes, againſt theſe heretikes: S.Epiphanius alſoe witneſſes that Simon Mahus excluded our Sauiour from the office of mediatour, and put the Angells in his place, as the Apoſtle ſeemes here to ſay.

The Third miſtake.

This text is made contrary to other texts of Scripture.

THirdly, the Religion, or worſhip of Angells here forbidden, cannot be all kinde of worſhip exhibited to them: for then this place of Scripture would be contrary to the other which I cited before, Gen.19.v.1. Ioſua 5.v.14. where Angells were lawfully worſhipped: and ſo this place cannot conclude any thing againſt vs: for if ſome worſhip may be lawfully giuen to Angells notwithſtanding this place, it can neuer be proued from hence, that the worſhip we giue them is forbidden, vnleſſe it be firſt proued to be vnlawfull, which can neuer be deduced from this generall prohibition.

And if any one ſhould obiect here that ſeeing this word *threſkeia* ſignifyes religion and vvorſhip, thence may be gathered, that all vvorſhip appertayning to Religion, or all religious

gius worſhip is forbidden, to be giuen to Angells. I anſwer, that if wee take religion and religious worſhip as it is ſtrictly and preſly taken amongſt the Doctours in its prime and formall acception, for a vertue whereby due honour is giuen immediately to God; it is true that all ſuch religion or religious worſhip is there forbidden to be giuen to Angells: and in this ſenſe noe Catholike teaches that religious worſhip is to be giuen to Angells, or any creature, but only to the creatour of all things, becauſe he only it true God: but if by religion or religious worſhip be vnderſtood in a larger ſenſe, a vertue or reuerence belonging to religion, and exceeding the bounds of nature and ciuill worſhip; then religious worſhip to Angells is not forbidden in this place. Now that religion may be taken in this larger ſenſe, is cleare as I haue allready ſhewed out of S. Iames now cited chap 1. v. 26. and 27. *If any man amongſt you ſeeme to be religiouus, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiueth his owne hart, this mans religion is vaine. Pure religion and vndeſyled before God and the father, is to viſit the fatherleſſe, and widowes, in their afflictions, and to keepe himſelfe vnſpotted from the world.*

Where wee ſee. that actions performed to creatures of piety and mercy, are called religion, and are religious actions: and ſo this worſhip, though it be done to creatures, may according

according to the phraſe of Scripture be called religious worſhip, at leaſt in this large ſenſe, that workes of piety and mercy are called religion, or religious actions here by S. Iames. And thus much for the ſecond place.

Wee are commanded to pray vnto God: therefore no preſumption but a bounden duty.

Proofes out of Scripture miſtaken.

Come vnto me all yee that labour, and are heauy loaden, and I will giue you reſt. Matth. 11. 28.

When you pray, ſay our father which art in heauen. And what ſoeuer yee ſhall aſke the father in my name, he will giue it you. Luke 11. v. 2. Iohn 16. v. 23.

Aſke and yee ſhall haue: ſeeke and yee ſhall finde knocke and it ſhall be opened vnto you. Luke 11. v. 9.

If the opponent meane here that wee are to pray to God without all preſumption of our ſelues, or our own workes (for the words are obſcure) wee moſt willingly admit this whole obiection, and all the proofes of it, as moſt conſonant with the doctrine of the Romain Church, and only againſt Pelagian and Semipelagian Hererikes.

For ſhee teacheth that the good workes of Gods children are truly good, and pleaſing to God, and meritorious of the increaſe of grace and eternall glory, yet ſhe teaches alſo Concil. Trid. ſeſſ. 6. can. 1. 2. 3.

that all good workes are the free gifts of God, proceeding from his grace, and not to be ascribed to any naturall force of ours left to it self, which is not able to doe any thing at all pleasing to Allmighty God; and so wee cannot glory in our selues, but in God only, as S. Paul teacheth vs: Againe she teacheth, that though the good workes of God's children be meritorious, as is declared, where they are; yet no man can be in this life (without a particular reuelation) infallibly assured that he is the child of God, or that he euer did any one worke truly good and pleasing to God; and so liues and dyes wholy relying vppon the mercies of God, and merits of our deare Saniours bitter death and Passion, of which he is assured by a firme and stedfast hope, not presumptuously relying vppon his owne workes, whereof he hath no sufficient assurance whereon to found his saluation: and so he is kept in a most humble and low esteeme of himselfe, and all he euer did through his whole life: for it is not the beleeuing that good workes where thy are, are meritorious, but the beleeuing that wee haue such meritorious workes, which can giue any shew of reason to rely vppon them: (I say beleeuing with an infallible faith which Reformers teach) for wee may and ought to haue a stedfast hope that through the grace of Christ,

Concil. Trid. sess. 6. c. 9. 16. can. 13. 14. 15.

wee

wee haue done ſome good workes and meritorious) as it is not the aſſurance that the abundance of mony and gould, where it is, is able to purchaſe great poſſeſſions, but the aſſurance that one hath ſuch an abundance of gould, which makes one confide that he is able to compaſſe ſuch a purchaſe: and yet, though a iuſt man ſhould infallibly know that he had done workes truly pleaſing to God, he would not be preſumptuous, becauſe he knowes they proceede from the grace of God. If therefore this be all that is intended by this obiection, that wee are commanded to *pray to God without all preſumption, and vppon bounden duty*, wee haue nothing againſt it: but if hereby be intended, that wee are commaunded to pray to God vppon boundē duty, and therefore it is noe preſumption to pray to him, yet ſo that wee are to pray to him alone, (as the inſuing obiections and proofes ſeeme to inſinuate) then wee giue our reaſons for the contrary, in the inſuing anſwer: which will be alſoe common to this: only à word or two vnto theſe fower places cited for proofe of this difficulty thus vnderſtood.

The text of Mat. 11. v. 28. miſtaken.

Matth. 11. v. 28. *Come vnto me all yee that labour, and are heauie loaden, and I will giue you reſt.*

THis text is in the mouth of euery ignorant Proteſtant, to proue that wee are neither to pray to ſaint nor Angell, but to Chriſt alone. *Come vnto mee*, ſaith our Sauiour: he bids vs not come vnto Saints, or Angells, ſay ſome illiterate Scripturiſtes: therefore wee muſt neither come to Saints nor Angells according to our Sauiours command. But how far this diſcourſe is from common ſenſe, euery vnderſtanding perſon will eaſily diſcouer: for, to ſay that our Sauiour bids vs not here come to Saints or Angells expreſſly, is moſt true: but that ſhewes only that coming to Saints or Angells is not here commanded, which no man makes queſtion of: for though the coming by prayer to them be not commanded here, yet that hinders not but eyther in ſome other place of Scripture, or by other lawfull authority commended in Scripture, it may be either commanded, or allowed: as if one ſhould argue againſt Proteſtants euen out of this place in this manner: our Sauiour ſayes Matth 11. v. 28. Come vnto mee all yee that labour &c. Hee ſayes not here addreſſe your prayers expreſſly, and by name to God the

the Father, or the holy Ghoſt, by ſaying *our Father which art in heauen* &c. or *come holy Ghoſt eternall God* &c. but come *vnto mee*, therefore it is vnlawfull to vtter ſuch perticular prayers to God the Father or the holy Ghoſt, expreſſing them by name, but all muſt be made to our Sauiour only. who ſees not how falſe and ſenſleſſe this reaſoning is? for though our expreſſe coming to God the Father and the holy Ghoſt be not commanded here, yet neyther is it forbidden, and is commanded in other places, and practized by the whole church of God, yea and by the Proteſtants themſelues.

Others vrge the Same text in this manner, *Come vnto me*, ſayth our Sauiour, Therefore to mee alone and to no other, and ſo neyther to Saint nor Angell; which hath as much force as this; *Come vnto mee*, ſayth our Sauiour: therefore goe not by name to any other diuine perſon but to me, and ſo neyther to God the Father, nor to God the holy Ghoſt expreſſly, who are two diſtinct Perſons from him: or as forcible as this, come vnto me all yee that are pore and noedy, and I will releeue you, ſaith ſome rich charitable perſon, to the pore of the citty where he dwells: therefore he commands them to come to no other but to him, and forbids them the aſking almes of any ſaue himſelfe. Or very like to this. *Come vnto*

me &c. ſayth our Sauiour: therefore to no other but to him; and ſo forbids children to pray to their Parents, or to beſeech other Chriſtians yet liuing to pray for them &c, which notwithſtanding Proteſtants dayly practiſe: for if our Sauiours meaning be to exclude all ſaue himſelfe, when he ſaid, come vnto me &c. then the liuing muſt be excluded noe leſſe, then the Saints and Angels of heauen: and if the Saints yet liuing be not excluded, then our Sauiour did not intend by thoſe words to exclude all, and if not all, then it can neuer be prouued from this text alone, that the coming, as wee doe, to Saints and Angels is forbidden in this text.

I anſwere therefore, that though our Sauiour in theſe words command all ſinners to come vnto him; yet he commands them not to come vnto him *only*; and ſo forbids not the comming vnto others, and this anſwer will, I hope ſatiſfy any conſiderate perſon ſtanding preciſely in the force of the wotds, and in what by true diſcourſe may be deduced from them.

Yet for a more full ſatisfaction, all Proteſtants are to underſtand, that when Catholikes come by prayr vnto any Saint or Angell, they ſtill performe, what our Sauiour here commands of comming to him: for wee come by their interceſſion mediately vnto him, when

wee

wee beg of them to pray to him for vs, no leſſe then Proteſtants children come mediatly vnto him by the interceſſion of their parents when they deſire them to pray to God to bleſſe them: and as the Centurian who by one Euangeliſt is ſayd to haue gone to our Sauiour; and yet by an other, he only went to ſome of his friends to ſpeake to our Sauiour for him; which was to come mediately, or by their meanes to him: eſpecially ſeeing that when wee pray to any Saint, or Angell, wee deſire that all theyr praires for vs may be heard through the merits of Chriſt.

Matth. 8. v. 5. 6. Luk. 7. v. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Concil. Trid. ſeſſ. 24.

The text of S. Luke miſtaken.

When you pray, ſay, our Father which art in heauen. Luk. 11.

THis text if it were only cited to proue, that wee ought to pray to God in this forme, is not againſt vs, but againſt thoſe Nouelliſts who diſallow of it. If to proue that wee are to pray in no other words nor forme ſuaue this; It concludes as much againſt Proteſtants, who vſe other formes, as againſt vs: if to proue that wee are only to pray to God the father, it contradicts the former of comming to God the Sone; and if to pray to God only and not to Saints, or Angells; it proues as well that one Chriſtian liuing may not pray to another. So that Proteſtants muſt con-

feſſe it proues either too much, or nothing. In a word, all that can be drawne from it, is, that it teaches an excellent forme of praying to God, as appeares by the Apoſtles demand, *Lord teach vs to pray*, and the ſcope of our Sauiours doctrine, againſt the hypocriſy of the Iewes. Matth. 6. v. 7.

The text of S. Iohn miſtaken.

Iohn. 16. v. 23. *VVhatſoeuer yee ſhall aſke the Father in my name, he will giue it you.*

THis is the conſtant and vniuerſall doctrine, and practiſe of the Church of Rome: for whether wee pray to any Perſon of the Bleſſed Trinity, or to any Saint, or Angell, or to Father or Mother, or any Chriſtian yet liuing, wee beg all *Per Dominum noſtrum Ieſum Chriſtum* &c. through our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, or in his name, knowing that nothing is to be demanded or granted in heauen or in earth but for his ſake. which I repeate often, becauſe it imports much.

Concil. Trid. ſeſſ. 24. Decret. de Inuoc. &c. ſuprà cit.

An other text of S. Luke miſtaken.

Luke 11. v. 9. *Aſke and yee ſhall haue, ſeeke and yee ſhall finde knocke, and it ſhall bee opened vnto you.*

THis text hath not ſo much as any ſhew of proofe againſt vs: for wee dayly aſke, and

and ſeeke, and knocke with full hope of what is here promiſed.

The third Proteſtant Poſition.

Chriſt our Sauiour only mediatour, our Aduocate *and interceſſour. how dare wee admit of any other?*

This is proued by Scipture miſtaken.

For there is one God, and one mediatour betwixt God and man, the man Chriſt Ieſus. 1. Tim. 15.

The firſt Proof miſtaken.

The word mediatour, miſapplyed againſt vs.

THis text ſpeakes of a mediatour of Redemtion only as appeares by the words following v. 6. *One mediatour* &c. *who gaue himſelfe a rauſome for all*, which all Romain Catholikes grant to be but only one, to wit, our Sauiour. *If any man ſin, we haue an Aduocate with the Father, Ieſus Chriſt the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our ſins, and not for ours, but alſo for the ſins of the whole world: It is Chriſt that dyed, yea rather that is riſen againe, who is euen at the right hand of God, who alſo maketh interceſſion for vs.* Concil. Trid. ſeſſ. 24. cit. 1. Io. 2. v. 1. & 2.

The

The ſecond Proof miſtaken.

The word Aduocate misvnderſtood and misapplyed.

IN this whole text, is not found that Chriſt *only* makes interceſſion for vs;or,that he *only* is our aduocate, (which is to be proued) all that is ſayd here, is, that *wee haue an Aduocate with the Father,Chriſt Ieſus* &c,and *who alſo waketh interceſsion for vs* ; which hinders not but that there may be other aduocates, and others who make interceſſion for vs,in an inferiour kinde;beſides,this text,(as the former) ſpeakes only of an aduocate, and interceſſour, of redemption for ſins,as appeares by thoſe words, *If any man ſin, we haue an aduocate* &c. and,*he is the propitiation for our ſins* , and, *it is Chriſt that dyed* &c. which wee grant muſt be only one Thirdly,the two texts ſpeake of an aduocate and interceſſour worthy to be heard for himſelfe and his owne merits ; which is our Saiour only,not of other inferiour interceſſours and aduocates, who are not worthy to be heard for themſerues, or by vertue of any merits proceeding from themſelues, conſidered according to their owne naturall forces,or dignities,but haue only acceſſe through the dignity & merits of Chriſt. This appeares by the words now cited, that they ſpeake of an

Concil. Trid.ſeſſ. 2. Decreto de Inuoc.&c.

an aduocate: worthy to bee heard for himſelfe. 1. Timoth. 2. v. 6. *VVho gaue himſelfe a ranſome for all.* 1. Ioannis 2. v. 1. 2. *Hee is the propitiation for our ſins, it is Chriſt that dyed:* ſo that if in the title of this obiection, when it is ſayd, *Chriſt our only mediatuor, our aduocate, and interceſſour, how dare wee admit of any other?* be meant, how dare wee admit of any other mediatour, aduocate, or interceſſour of redemption, and propitiation for our ſins, and who is worthy to be heard for his own dignity and merits, all Romain Catholikes vnanimouſly grant that wee dare not admitt of any other ſaue Chriſt: but if by the ſame words, be meant, how dare wee admit of any other mediatuor, aduocate, or interceſſour, not of Redemption, but merely of praying to Allmighty God for vs as his ſeruants, and our friends and fellow ſeruants, and that to be heard not for themſelues, but for Chriſt; wee may returne the ſame queſtion vppon Proteſtans, and demaund of them, how dare they permit their children euery night to kneele downe and beg of their parēts, that they will pray to God to bleſſe them: for what is this but to be a mediatour, aduocate, and interceſſour, betwixt God and them, not of propitiation, or redemption, but of praying to God for them through the metits of Chriſt? The ſame practiſe amongſt Proteſtants is, of grand-children,

dren, nephewes, god-children &c. nay of all generally amongst them, commending themselues to the praires of others. So that it is euident, that such aduocates as these, euen according to Protestants are not to be excluded by vertue of these texts, vnlesse they will condemne themselues. And this is the very same intercession that wee put amongst the Saints and Angells in heauen; because both the one and the other pray to God for vs through the merits of Christ; neither imports it for our present question of one sole aduocate, &c. that those to whom wee pray, be in this world or in heauen: for if there be but only one, then no lesse those others on earth, then those in heauen, are excluded: or if the intercession for vs vppon earth be not excluded by force of this text, then Protestants must confesse that they themselues must acknowledge Christ, not so to be our mediatour, aduocate, and intercessour, but that they dare, and doe admit of others, and so are faulty themselues in what they accuse vs: or if they ackuowledge no fault in this, as indeed there is none, then they must cease to accuse vs, and vse the same distinction and explications of the texts, here cited in the obiection, with vs; to wit, that they admit only one mediatour, or intercessour, and aduocate of Redemption and Saluation, where of the texts

Concil. Trid. cit.

speake

ſpeake, but more then one, of praying vnto Allmighty God with vs, and for vs by way of charity, and ſociety, (as S. Auguſtine ſayes) whereof the texts doe not ſpeake: or thus, that there is but one only interceſſour which is worthy to be heard for his own dignity and merits; but more then one, who are made worthy by the merits of Chriſt, who is that only independent mediatour, and all others depending of him, and his merits. Beſides theſe are mediatours, and interceſſours to Chriſt as he is both God and man, for vs, which Chriſt cannot be to himſelfe, for a mediatour muſt be bewixt two, as S. Paul ſaith. Contra Fauſtum Manicheum l.12, c.21. Gal.3.20.

The Third miſtake.

It hath beene alwayes the practiſe of God's Saints in their troubles, and at all tymes, to call vppon him.

VVhen I was in trouble, I called vppon the Lord, and he heard me. Pſal.119.1

Moyſes, and Aaron, and Samuel, theſe called vppon the Lord, and he heard them. Pſal.98.6

And in the night Paul and Silas being in Priſon, prayed, and ſung prayſe to God; ſo that the priſoners heard them. Acts16. v.25.

The

The third proof miſtaken.

Theſe texts are cited to no purpoſſe.

WEe grant all this as nothing at all againſt our doctrine or practice; for who can deny that wee both teach, and vſe to pray to God in all occaſious, and in all our tribulations. But if it be intended that theſe texts, proue that wee are at all tymes to pray to God, and ſo at noe time to any creature, to pray to God through Chriſt for vs, it is a pure miſtake, for the texts ſay noe ſuch matter.

The fourth miſtake.

BY all this is playne, that it is the ancienteſt, the beſt and the ſafeſt way to come only to God in our prayers; and the contrary doctrine is both new, and abſolutely againſt Gods word.

This miſtake diſcouered.

Noe ſuch mater can be draun, from the texts cited, for by all that I haue anſwered, appeares, that Proteſtans themſelues, come not only to God in their prayers, but haue recourſe oftentymes one to an others prayers, and deſire others to pray to God with them, and for them, no leſſe nor otherwiſe then do thoſe of the Romain Church, and therrfore this

this practice eyther muſt be ancient and agreeing with Gods word, or the Proteſtants practice is new, and againſt Gods word. Here alſoe may be added, as a further ſatisfaction to theſe aboue cited miſtaken Proofes, that there is an other maine difference betwixt praying to Chriſt, the Bleſſed Trinity, or any of the diuine Perſons; and our praying to an Angel, a heauenly Saint, or a good Chriſtian yet liuing. For our praires to God, and Chriſt as our only Redeemer, are ſtritly commãded, and are neceſſary meanes to Saluation, and are acts, belonging to the worſhip of God properly and primarily, and ſoe are exercizes appertayning to the vertue of Religion taken preſly, and thus the inuocation, or praying, to eyther Angel, Saint, or liuing Chtiſtian, is neyther vniuerſally commanded, nor a meanes abſolutly neceſſary to ſaluation, (though it be a very great helpe towards it) nor an act belonging immediarely, and neceſſarily to the ſtrict vertue of Religion, or the worſhip of God; bur an exercice good and profitable, and neceſſarily to be eſteemed as ſuch, by all true Chriſtians, as I haue allready deduced out of the Councel of Trent. which I thought fit to renew in the Readers memory, leaſt the contrary miſconceipt amongſt Proteſtants, of our doctrine in this poinct, might alienate his affection from our Religion. If any one de-

Concil. Trid. ſeſſ. 24. cit.

fire to haue the inuocation of Saints and Angels, (thus explicated) prouued by Scripture, he may please to examine, Iob. 5. 1. *Call if there be any which will answer the, and to which of the Saints wilt thou turne?* where the seauenty Interpreters haue it in Greeke, ἢ εἴπνα Ἀγγέλων ἁγίων ὄφει, that is, & turne the to some of the holy Angels. And Gen. 48. v. 16. *The Angel which redeemed me from all euil, blesse these Laddes.* which is a plaine inuocation of an Angel, as in the former verse 15. the like speech was an inuocation of God. And lastly the first of Samuel, 28. v. 7. to the 22. where the Scripture affirmes expresly. 1. thrice ouer that Samuel himselfe appeared, v. 15. 16. 20. 2. that Saul worshipped him, and Samuel did not forbid him, and soe accepted of it, v. 14. 3. that Saul desired Samuel to assist him, and soe inuoked him, v. 15. 4. that Samuel propheſied truly what should become of Saul and the Israelites army under him, as apprares in the next chapter, which was a manifest signe that he who appeared was not the diuel, but a true Prophete of God, both becausse the diuel hath noe certaine knowledge of accidentall, and casuall things to come, as those which Samuel foretold were, and becausse the Prophete Ierem. c. 28. v. 9. giues this for the signe of a true Prophete sent from God, *The Prophete which propheſieth of peace, when the word of the Prophete ſhall come*

come to paſſe, then ſhall the Prophete be known, that the Lord hath truly ſent him. That he who here appeared to Saul, was Samuel hemſelfe, and that he truly propheſied, is witneſſed by Eccleſiaſticus c.46.v.20. *And after his death he propheſied, and ſhewed the king his ende, and lift vp his voyce from the earth in propheſie, to blot out the wickedneſſe of the people:* which booke though it be not accounted canonicall by Proteſtants, yet they muſt acknowledge it to be of greater authority, then any they can alleadge of theyr party, to proue that it was not Samuel. neyther concluds the reaſon, brought commonly by Proteſtants any thing againſt this, for though Saul had recourſe to that witch to raiſe him vp Samuel, and ſhe had conſented to doe it, yet the text ſayes not that her conjuring raiſed him, or that he was inforced to come by force of her witchcraft, for firſt Samuel attributes his coming vp not to her, but to Saul, v.15. why haſt thou diſquieted me? ſecondly, it ſeemes that ſoe ſoone as the woman had conſented to Sauls petition, that Samuel (by the power of God) preuenting her wicked conjurings, came vp unexpectedly, and ſuddainly, and in a terrible, and unuſuall maner, and therefore the text ſaies, v.12. *And when the woman ſaw Samuel, ſhe cried out with a lowd voyce.* Thirdly, That woman ſaid not, I raiſed, but I ſaw Gods aſcending from the

but read yᵉ 21. v. of yᵉ 28. c. of 1. of Samuel

earth, where the Hebrew word, *Elohim*, Gods is vety ordinarily taken for good Spirits, or Angels in the old teſtament.

Theſe three texts may ſuffice for the preſent, it being not my intention to proue, but to defend.



THE

THE SECOND CONTROVERSIE

Concerning the making and worſhipping of holy Images.

The Doctrine of the Romain Chruch, concerning the uſe and veneration of holy Images, deliuered in the Council of Trent ſeſſ. 24.

MAndat ſancta Synodus omnibus Epiſcopis, & cęteris docendi munus curamque ſuſtinentibus, vt — fideles diligenter inſtruant, docentes eos — Imagines — Chriſti, Deiparæ Virginis, & aliorum Sanctorum, in templis præſertim habendas, & retinendas, eiſque debitum honorem, & venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur ineſſe aliqua in iis diuinitas vel virtus, propter quam ſint colendæ, vel quod ab eis ſit aliquid petendum, vel quod fiducia *in* Imaginibus ſit figenda; veluti olim fiebat à Gentibus, quæ in Idolis ſpem ſuam collocabant, ſed quoniam honos qui eis exhibetur referrur ad Prototypa, quæ illæ re-

præſentant: ita vt per imagines, quas oſculamur,& coram quibus caput aperimus,& procumbimus, Chriſtum adoremus,& Sanctos quorum illæ ſimilitudinem gerunt venere, mur. Id quod conciliorum, præſertim verò ſecundæ Nicenæ Synodi decretis contra imaginum oppugnatores eſt ſancitum.

THe holy Councill commands all Biſhops, and all others who haue the office and care, of teaching, that they diligently inſtruct faithfull people, teaching them that the Images of Chriſt, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other Saincts, are to be had, and reteyned, eſpecially in churches, and that due honour and veneration is to be giuen to them, not that one beleeues that there is any diuinity in them, or power, for which they are to be worſhipped, or that one is to aſck any thing of them, or that confidence is to be put in them, as anciently the gentiles did, who placed theyr hope in Idoles, but becauſe the honour which is done to them, is referred to thoſe whom they repreſent. Soe that through the Images which we kiſſe, and before which we uncouer our heades, and proſtrate our ſelues, we worſhip Chriſt and his Saints whoſe ſimilitudes they are. which doctrine is eſtabliſhed by the decrees of Councils, eſpecially of the ſecond Council of Nice.

Seeing

Seeing therefore here the Council of Trent, expreſly commands that all Biſhops, and Paſtours &c. teach this doctrine to all faithfull Chriſtians, noe Aduerſary of the Romain Church, can eyther doubt in prudēce, whether this be her doctrine, nor in charity iudge or affirme vppon a mere coniecturall ſuppoſition, without any certaine and particular information, or proof, that Romain Catholicques commonly, and ordinarily pray to pictures, and put theyr confidence, and hope in them, beleeuing that there is power, life, and diuinity in thoſe carued, or panited Images which they haue before them, and ſoe hoping to be heard and helped by them, as the heathens did by theyr Idoles, this I ſay, noe man can ſay, or iudge in charity, becauſe he muſt eyther iudge that the Prelates, and Paſtours of our church, are generally neglecting to teach the faithfull vnder theyr charge, what they are here commanded, which would be to accuſe them of a high, and hainous neglect, or he muſt iudge that faithfull people, beeing ſufficiently taught this doctrine by theyr reſpectiue Paſtours are proudly diſſobedient to theyr Paſtours, and the whol church in doing the quite contrary to what thy are taught, which were to condemne them of a greeuous ſinne, and that without any ſufficient reaſon, vppon a mere coniecture, or voluntary and

rash iudgement contrary to the expresse command of our Sauiour, Luc.6.37. *Nolite iudicare, & non iudicabimini. Iudge not, and you shall not be iudged.* And as contrary to that of S. Paul, Rom.14.4. *Tu quis es qui iudicas alienum seruum, domino suo stat aut cadit. VVho art thou who iudges an others seruant, he stands, or falls to his own maister.*

The Council of Trent in the same session.

IN has autem sanctas ac salutares obseruationes si qui abusus irrepserint, eas prorsus aboleri sancta Synodus vehementer cupit, ita vt nullæ falsi dogmatis Imagines, & Rudibus periculosi erroris occasionem præbentes, statuantur.

But if any abuses haue crept into these holy and profitable obseruations, the holy Council vehemently desires that they be wholy abolished, or taken away, soe that there be not exposed any Images teaching false doctrine, and giuing occasion of dangerous errour to the common people. And then the Council addes these wrds.

Quod si aliquando historiæ & narrationes sacræ Scripturæ cùm id indoctæ plebi expediet, exprimi, & figurari contigerit; doceatur populus, non propterea diuinitatem fignrari, vel quasi corporeis oculis conspici, vel coloribus aut figuris exprimi posse.

But if some times it happen that the histories, or passages of holy Scripture be expressed, and figured out

in

in pictures, when that ſhall be expedient for the vnlearned, let the people be taught, that thereby the diuinity is not painted, eyther as if it could be ſeene by corporeall eyes, or expreſſed by coulours or figures. And preſently after.

Omnis porro ſuperſtitio in Sanctorum inuocatione, reliquiarum veneratione, & Imaginum ſacro vſu tollatur, omnis turpis quæſtus eliminetur, omnis denique laſciuia vitetur.

Moreouer let all ſuperſtition in the inuocation of Saints, the veneration of reliques, and the holy vſe of Images be taken away, let all baſe lucre be baniſhed, and let all immodeſtie be auoyded.

And leaſt any Proteſtant ſhould conceiue that the ſecond Council of Nice, cited here by the Council of Trent, deliuers any doctrine contrarie to what is here deliuered, I thought fit to adioyne the words of that Council.

The ſecond Council of Nice Actione 3.

NOn materiæ vel coloribus cultum offerentes, ſed per hæc inuiſibilibus viſibus ad principalem adducti honorem illi debitum impendentes. Scientes ſecundùm Baſilium Magnum, quòd Imaginis honor ad principalem tranſeat.

Not preſenting worſhip to the matter or coulours, but through theſe being brought to the perſon repreſented by them, wee giue due honour to him. Knowing

according to Basil the Great, that the honour of the Image passes to him who is represented by it.

Hauing deliuered the doctrine of the Romain Church in this point of Images, let vs now see what her Aduersaries produce against it out of *Scripture mistaken.*

The first Protestant Position.

It is not lawfull to represent God the Father in any likenesse whatsoeuer of any Image.

This is proued by Scripture mistaken.

The first Proof.

Rom. 3. v. 23. *They changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an Image made like to a corruptible man, and to birds, and to foure footed beasts, and to creeping things.*

The second Proof.

Deut. 4. v. 15. 16. *Take yee therefore good heed vnto your selues: for yee saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke to you in Horeb, out of the middest of the fier.*

Least you corrupt your selues, and make you a grauen image, the similitude of any figure, the likenesse of male or female.

These

Theſe proofs miſtaken.

THeſe texts are miſſappleyed againſt the doctrine of the Romain Church, wee grant moſt willingly all that is ſayd here: neither do wee euer repreſent God the Father by any image at all immediatly or directly: that is to ſignify that he is of a figure or ſhape like that image: but cheefly (as wee haue now ſhewed in the Council of Trent) wee repreſent by our Images, the figures wherin he appeared to the ancient Prophets, hiſtorically. *And I beheld till the thrones were caſt down; and the ancient of dayes did ſit: whoſe garmẽts were white as ſnow; & the hayre of his head like to pure woll.* This figure here deſcribed by the Prophet Daniel we repreſent: neither is it forbidden in any of the places alleadged, or any other of holy Scripture, to repreſent the figures wherin Allmighty God hath pleaſed to repreſent himſelfe: for where is it forbidden to repreſent by way of hiſtory, this viſion of Daniel as he deſcribes it, or the viſion of other Prophets, and of S. Iohn in the Apocalyps, more then any other hiſtoryes of Scripture? Let any ſuch place be produced: neyther by ſuch repreſentations, do Romain Catholikes more beleeue that God the Father is an old man, then did Daniel the Prophet beleeue he was one, when he ſaw this viſion. For the Roman Church

Concil. Trid. cit.

Dan. 7. v. 9. 13. 22.

Church both ſtedfaſtly beleeues her ſelfe, and ſtrictly commands all her Prelats, Paſtours, and teachers, to inſtruct all her children, that God is a pure ſpirit in himſelfe, and hath no body, or figure, at all; and that ſuch like pictures are not to repreſent God immediately, but the figures wherin he appeared: And this euen the little children are taught in their catechiſmes: and if ſome chance to be ignorant of it, it is not the Churches fault, but the fault of her particular Paſtours, who are negligent in inſtructing their flockes: as alſo ignorant people may eaſily fall to thinke as well amongſt Proteſtants, as Catholikes, that God the Father hath a right hand, & conſequently a body, becauſe they haue mention of his right hand in their creed: and the like is in many places of Scripture (read ordinarily by common people in England) where God is ſayd to haue feet, hands, head, face, mouth, eyes, eares, and particularly in this viſion of Daniell, and others of S. Iohn in the Reuelations, if theſe words be not, by negligence of Paſtours, or Miniſters, well explicated: and yet notwithſtanding, as theſe words, *he ſits at the right hand of God the Father Allmighty*, and the like, are not to be blotted out of the creed, or Scripture, but to be well explicated; ſo alſo thoſe pictures, though ſome, through their Paſtours negligence, may fall into errour by them, are not

not to be taken away, but explicated and expounded according to the grounds of the Christian faith, and the doctrine of the Catholicke Chruch. Yet if any one would vrge that some attributes of God may be signifyed by some pictures which are vsed in the Catholicke Church, I answer, that thence followes not that we intend to picture the Diuinity, or nature of God, or to signify that it is a visible, corporall thing like to that picture, but only to make a hieroglyphicall expression of certaine attributes as wee doe when we represent vertues or vices in certaine shapes, of men or weomē, the better to expresse the nature of them, not to signify that they are corporall, or like to those persons. Thus the white haire mentioned by Daniell, signifyes the neuer begining, nor ending eternity of God: the crown, scepter, and world his absolute dominion ouer all things: the light about him, his infinite glory: and so of the rest.

Only here I thought fit, to note, that (according to the Council of Trent aboue cited) The Church of Rome, hath not commanded, nor ordayned, that the Pictures, which thus represent the apparitions of God the Father or God the holy Ghost, should be had, and reteyned especially in churchs, for there the Council mentions only the Images of our Sauiour, and of Saints; but she only tolerates,

or

or permits that such other pictures may be made, when it is found expedient; and that only historically.

The second Protestant Position.

Noe Image whatsoeuer ought to be worshipped.

This is proued by Scripture mistaken.

The first Proofe.

Leuit. 26. v. 1. *YEe shall make you no Idolls, nor grauen Images; neither reare yee vp a standing image: neither shall yee set vp an Image of stone in your Land to bowe downe to it; for I am the Lord your God.*

The first mistake.

Noe word in this text, necessarily signifies Image in the originall which is heere translated Image.

HEre is named *Image* three tymes, in so few words; and yet neither the 70. Interpretes in greeke, nor the vulgar translation in Latine, haue so much as once this word *Image* in the whole verse: neither is there any word in the Hebrew text, which necessarily signifyes *Image*, in this place, as is cleare out of Pagni-

Pagninus his tranſlation, word for word; So that this appeares alſoe to be a miſtake like the former, Coloſſ. 2. to deceiue the ignorant reader, by making him abhorre holy *Images*, ſeeing them ſo clearly and often forbidden in his Engliſh Bible. I deny therefore that Images are forbidden in this place, or the reuerence due to them: and it belongs to Proteſtants to proue it, neither will it be inough if they proue that ſome one of theſe words may be taken to ſignify an Image; for they muſt ſhew that it muſt needs ſignify an Image, in this very place, if they will conuince any thing againſt the worſhip of holy Images, out of it, for it may ſignify alſo that which is no Image: and till they proue that it neceſſarily here ſignifyes an Image, they effect nothing, eſpecially ſeeing that though any of theſe words in the Hebrew might ſignify an Image in ſome ſecondary ſinification, yet here they doe not: both becauſe the 70. Interpreters, and the ancient vulgar tranſlation, and Pagninus, and almoſt all (ſaue the new Proteſtant tranſlations) put it otherwiſe; and becauſe the firſt word, *Elilim* in Hebrew ſignifyes an Idol or falſe God, as it is here tranſlated by Proteſtants, and cõſequently all the words following muſt be taken for Idolls to agree with it; the difference betwixt an Idol, and an Image, I will giue you preſently. Elilim.

The

The Second Proofe.

Exod. 20. v. 4. 5. *THou ſhall not make to thy ſelfe any grauen Image, nor the likeneſſe of any thing that is in heauen, aboue, or in the earth beneath, or in the water vnder the earth: thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor worſhip them.*

The Second miſtake.

The Hebrew, and Greek words here put, *Grauen Image* are miſtranſlated.

HEre againe is the word, grauen Image, put in to the Engliſh text, contrary both to the Hebrew and Greeke text: the Hebrew word here is פֶּסֶל *peſel*, which the 70. Interpreters in this place tranſlate in the Greeke εἴδωλον, an Idol, or falſe God, and the Latine, *ſculptile*, which in the eccleſiaſticall ſignification, is always through the whole Scripture taken for an Idol or repreſentation of a falſe God, when it is forbidden; as alſo the Hebrew word *peſel*, which is neuer taken in a good ſenſe for any Image truly repreſenting anything exiſtent as it is really in it ſelfe, as carued or grauen curioſityes.

Now the difference betwixt an Image, and an Idol is this: an Image is a repreſentation of a true thing, which either is, or is poſſible to be, in that very maner wherin he who makes

or

or vſes the Image, intends to repreſent it as the paintings or caruings of trees, of flowers, of beaſts, of men, or women, which we ordinarily vſe in our houſes. Thus the word *Image* is taken, Gen. 1.26. and 27. Gen. 5. v. 36. Deut. 4. v. 16. 2. Cor. 4. v. 4. Coloſſ. 1. v. 15. and in many other places: and in Hebrew it is called *tſalem* in Greeke εἰκων, *ikon*.

But an Idol is a repreſentation of what neither is, nor can poſſibly be as he who makes, or vſees it, intends to repreſent it; and therfore is called Abacuc 2. v. 18. *a falſe phantaſie* in the 70. Interpreters, and according to the Hebrew, a thing which tells a lye, that is, repreſets that to be, which neither is, not can be. And Iſay 44. v. 10. an Idol is called vanity, or, profitable for nothing. And S. Paul 1. Cor. 8. 4. we know that an Idol is nothing in the world; becauſe it repreſents that to be God, which neither is, nor poſſibly can be God, becauſe there is but one only true God; and therefore in Hebrew, Idols are called Elilim, that is vanity, or falſity; and in Greeke εἴδολον, that is, an empty and Idle fiction of the brayne. Hence it comes to paſſe that the very ſame materiall repreſentation, may in diuers reſpects be an Image, and an Idol; an Image, in regard of that which is truly repreſented by it; an Idol, in reference to that which it repreſents falſly and lyingly. Thus the picture of the Sun is an

Image therof, ſo far as it repreſents the face, beames, and figure of the viſibile ſun, and puts vs in remembrance of it: But the very ſame materiall picture will be an Idol in as much as it is made to repreſent the ſun as a God, and a ſouéraine diuine power, as the heathens repreſent it in their Idols; And hence by different perſons, the ſame materiall picture, or ſtatue may be eſteemed and reſpected as an Image, or as an Idol: for a true Chriſtian ſeeing the Image of the Sun, will regard only the true repreſentation of the true ſuñe in it; but the Heathen will eſteeme it as conteyning, or repreſenting ſome diuinity or deity, and ſo to him it will be an Idol. That which here I exemplify in the Sunnes picture, is to be extended to all other repreſentations of men, or other creatures: for if any one, in an hiſtoricall way would repreſent ſome reall paſſage in the life of Mars, Iuno, Iupiter, Saturne, Venus &c. as they were men, or weomen once here liuing vppon earth, and go no further; thoſe very pictures will be Images only, that is, true repreſentations of that which once was; but if one intend to draw their pictures, or carue their ſtatues, with deſigne to repreſent them as Gods and Goddeſſes; it will be in that regard no Image, but a pure Idol, falſly repreſenting that to be God, which neither was, nor can be God.

And

And the very ſame different reſpect is in force in thoſe very pictures which Proteſtants allow of: for if one ſhould haue the pictures of Queene Elizabeth, or King Iames, merely to repreſent them as they indeed were, the one true King, the other true Queen of England, the would be Images only; but if a Heathen ſhould make a God of each of them (as they vſed to doe of their ancient Kings and Queenes) and intend to acknowledge them, by that picture, as ſuch, thoſe very pictures would become Idols, falſly repreſenting, what neither was, is, nor can be. And the ſame rule is to be verifyed in the Catholike pictures of Saints: for if they be only repreſented as holy perſons, as Martyrs, as Virgins, as glorious in heauen with their and our God, then their pictures are only true Images, as truly repreſenting the Saints as they are.

But if any one through ignorance, or malice, ſhould attribute any diuine power, or any thing proper to God, to them, or account them Gods, or Goddeſſes, to ſuch the pictures of Saints would be no Images, but Idols.

This therefore ſuppoſed as neceſſary to diſtinguiſh, betweene an Image and an Idol, I anſwer to the text of Exodus cited in the obiection, that both according to the hebrew פֶּסֶל *peſel*, and the greeke εἴδωλον, *idolum*, and the ancient Latin *ſculptile*, that which is here forbid-

Exod. 20. v. 4. d.

forbidden, is an Idol, and not an Image, as the Proteſtants Engliſh Tranſlation falſly hath it; and conſequently the other word following *Temounach*, which in hebrew ſignifies an Idol alſo, which repreſents any creature falſely as a God; it being only a declaration of the former word *peſel*, and ſo ſignifying the very ſame thing which *peſel* ſignifyes, that is an Idol; which the cõiunction *ve* (*and* in Engliſh) not obſcurely declares to ſuch as are ſkilfull in the hebrew tongue, which ioynes two words togeather, in the ſame ſignification for greater explication: and yet this is made wholy out of doubt Deut. 5. v. 8. as it ſtands in the hebrew *Lo tegaſe lecha, peſel, col temounach* &c. where the very ſame words of Exodus 20. are repeated, *thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe an Idol, all the likeneſſes in heauen:* where the ſenſe is nothing but this, thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe an Idol, that is any likeneſſe or figure in heauen: ſo that all the likeneſſes forbidden in the 20. of Exodus, are the ſame which are forbidden here Deut. 5. that is, ſuch as are *peſel, Idolls*, or repreſentations of falſe Gods. And this is further confirmed out of Exod. 20. v. 23. where God himſelfe explicates thoſe former words in the ſame chapter. v. 4. *you ſhall not make to your ſelues Gods of ſiluer: nor you ſhall nor make to your ſelues Gods of gould*, which are *peſel*, and *temounach*, Exod. 20. v. 4. and yet laſtly that *peſel* put there

in

in the Hebrew, ſignifyes the ſame with *el*, a God, is moſt cleare out of Eſay 44.v.10. *who hath formed a God, or molten a grauen Image which is profitable for nothing.* in hebrew the word here is *peſel;* and though the Proteſtant Engliſh tranſlation haue it, *grauen Image falſely*, as I noted before, yet certayne it is, that euen according to your owne tranſlation, it here ſignifyes the ſame with a falſe God, as is cleare out of the words, and yet much clearer in the 17.verſe, *and of the riſidue of it he maketh a God, euen his grauen Image*, ſaith your tranſlation; where the ſame peece of wood carued, is called a God of the heathens, and a grauen Image; in hebrew, *lephiſlo*, *his Idol*, or grauen repreſentation of a falſe God, and yet to ſhew vnanſwearably that this word *peſel*, euen by Reformes ought to be tranſlated *Idol*, or at leaſt is capable of that ſignification, let any Proteſtant read his more ancient tranſlations, and he ſhall find that which is called *grauen Image*, in the later tranſlations, to be called *Idol*, or *his Idol*, v.17. of the 44.of Iſay in theyrmore ancient, which in Hebrew is *Pheſel Phiſelo*, which in this 20. of Exodi v.4. they alwayes tranſlate *grauen Image*. (See the Bibles printed, in King Edwards tyme, and others of the moſt ancient Proteſtant Prints,) comimg of the word *peſel* ſo often cited.

Hauing therefore demonſtraded, that in

the two places cited in the obiection, Exod. 20 v 4, and Leuiticus the 26. v. 1. no other picture, repreſentation, or likeneſſe of any creature is forbidden, but only ſuch as are intended, to repreſent them, by way of Idolatry, as Gods, and deityes, (which they neither are, nor can be) and not as creatures, Saints, Angells, &c. which they truly are. The ſecõd poynt propounded in the obiection, about the worſhip of pictures, or Images, of our Sauiour, or Saints, &c. will eaſily be determined: for it muſt be a worſhip, (which is forbidden in the forenamed places) proportionate or correſpondent to the thing which thoſe Idols repreſent; which is a God; and that can be nothing elſe but a diuine worſhip, or an homage giuen to a diuine power: and this is ſo cleare, that none who vnderſtand it, can doubt of it. Yet becauſe I intend, as much as may be, to confirme euery thing I ſay, by cleare texts of holy Scripture, we muſt firſt note, that the fooliſh Idolatry of the Heathens condemned in holy Scripture (almoſt throughout) is that they did adore, worſhip, and pray to that very materiall grauen, or paynted thing (which they had before theyr eyes) as a God: This is ſo euident out the 44. of Eſay, v. 17. iuſt now cited, that it puts the matter out of queſtion, euen as it ſtands in your owne Bible: *And the reſidue therof he maketh a God, euen a grauen Image;*

Image; he falleth downe vnto it, and worſhippeth it, and prayeth vnto it, and ſaith, deliuer me, for thou art my God. So alſo is this matter clearly ſet downe in the booke of wiſdome, chapters 13. and 14. in many verſes at large: which, though Proteſtants receiue not as Canonicall Scripture, yet they put it in their Bibles, and therefore eſteeme it not to be a lying fable, eſpecially agreeing ſo well in this matter with other parts of Canonicall Scripture. So alſo Ieremy 2. v. 28. and 16. v. 20. Dan. 3. v. 12. 14. 18. and the 5. v. 4. 23. Oſeas 8. v. 6. Pſal. 133. v. 4. and many other places which I omit for breuitys ſake: where it appeares clearly that the Heathens, and Idolaters eſteemed that viſible picture before them to be a God, and to haue power to heare their prayers, and to helpe them, and ſo they bowed vnto it, worſhipped it with diuine honour, prayed to it, and put their hope in it. This ſuppoſed as certaine, it will preſently be thought moſt reaſonable to vnderſtand that worſhip of pictures, or reſemblances of things to be forbidden, Leuit. 26. v. 1. and Exod. 20. v. 4. which is generally explicated in ſo many other paſſages of holy Scripture; for by clearer places the more obſcure are to be explicated and expounded, euen according to Proteſtants: Seeing therefore, the word *bowing downe, and worſhipping* in the Proteſtants tranſlation is ſet downe in the two ſayd pla-

ces, generally and without clearly expreſſing what kind of worſhip is meant, we muſt gather the further explication of it out of other places of holy Scripture, where it is more diſtinctly and clearly deliuered: and indeed, though the text in the 20. of Exod. be obſcure, and generall in Proteſtants tranſlations in theſe words, *thou ſhalt not bow downe to them, nor worſhip them*, yet in hebrew, and the 70. in greeke there is light enough giuen to direct vs in the true vnderſtanding of them, namely, that it is a diuine worſhip alone, which is forbidden; for the hebrew words *ve lo tagauethem* ſignify, *and you ſhall not ſerue them*; which word ſhewes an homage or ſeruice done to thoſe Idols, as to things capable of ſuch offices done vnto them, and endued with knowledge, vnderſtanding, power, and diuinity: for no man is ſtrictly and properly ſayd to ſerue that which is wholy voyd of knowledge to exact or accept of that ſeruice: and hence appeares, that if the Proteſtāts had followed cloſely the firſt and ordinary ſignification of this word in the originall (as they profeſſe to do) and tranſlated it thus, *thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor ſerue them*, the word *ſerue* would haue giuen occaſion of vnderſtanding a right the word *bow down*, that is ſuch a bowing down as is vſed to thoſe whom wee ſerue, who are only in the proper & ordinary vnderſtanding

of

of ſeruice, ſuch as we eſteeme to be endued with knowledge nnderſtanding, and power, able to receiue our ſeruice, and aſſiſt vs in our petitions. And to demonſtrate that this tranſlation of yours is not without partiality and dubble dealiug, of putting *worſhip* for *ſerue*, the word *worſhip* being put in of purpoſe to bring the ignorant people from the reuerence of holy Images, as they are reuerenced amongſt Romain Catholikes; you muſt know, that in ahundred other places of Scripture where Moyſes, Caleb, Ioſua, Dauid, and othets are called ſeruants of God, in your tranſlation, not worſhippers, the hebrew hath the very ſame word *gauedy my ſeruant*, which is vſed here in the 20. of Exodus; end yet further the fraud appeares more clearly Hier. 13. v. 10. the 16. v. 11. and 22. v. 9. where the two very ſame words put in hebrew, which are in Exod. 20. now cited, and applyed to falſe Gods, are alwayes tranſlated *adore*, and *ſerue*, becauſe it ſerued not their purpoſe to tranſlate it otherwiſe; only in Exod. 20. and the like to breed a hatred of the worſhip of holy Images, in the common peoples minds, it muſt be tranſlated *fall down and worſhip*: and yet more clearly by their owne tranſlation they conuince themſelues of partiality; for in the Pſalme 96. aliter the 97. v. 7. they haue theſe words; *confounded be all thoſe who ſerue grauen Images, who booſt themſelues*

ſelues of Idols: where in the Hebrew, the ſame words are, which are Exod.20. *gauthe', peſel:* where alſo may be gathered, that, that which they pleaſe falſly to tranſlate *grauen Image*, is the very ſame with a heathen Idol, as being ioyned with it as the ſame thing in ſignification. And to vrge an other place, this partiality is clearly conuinced out of the firſt text cited by the perſon who writ it: Matth. 4. v. 10. *It is written, thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerue:* where the 6. of Deut. v. 13. (from which that of S. Matthew is taken) hath the very ſame hebrew word *gauedth*, which is here tranſlated *worſhip* in the 20. of Exodus, and there *ſerue*. But to put all out of queſtion, and to bring an vndeniable diſcouery of their fraud and falhood in the tranſlating of this hebrew word *gauedh worſhip*, not *ſerue*, it is to be noted, that in their more ancient tranſlations of theſe words. Exod. 20. v. 4. they tranſlated it, thou ſhalt *not bow down vnto them, nor worſhip them*, as appeares by the text here cited in the obiection, and by the Bibles themſelues: but in their later impreſſions and tranſlations of the yeare 1638. and ſomwhat before, and ſince, they haue corrected this errour, and put it, *thou ſhalt not bouw down vnto them, nor ſerue them*, both in Eod. and Leuiticus: yet becauſe they had taught all the common people to ſay it after the ancient erroneous māner, it is

still

ſtill in the cate-hiſme ſet down in the common prayre booke, *thou ſhalt not bow down vnto them, nor worſhip them*, leaſt if they ſhould haue changed it there, the people might haue diſcouered that they had beene taught their commandements amiſſe, and that in the ancient editions of the common prayer, the commandements were otherwiſe then in the latter: but the correction in the Bible might more eaſily be admitted, becauſe few of the common people read the commandements as they ſtand there. But that at one view may be ſeene the manifold tricks and diuiſes, frauds, and deceits vſed in the ſophiſticating and falſifying of this text in their tranſlations, I will briefly ſet them all down together: Firſt therefore, contrary to both hebrew and greeke, and Latin, and all antiquity, they tranſlate, *peſel*, εἴδωλον, *ſculptile*; grauen Image. Secondly, they ad the word *any*; *thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen Image*; which is not in the hebrew, but thus, thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelue *an Idol*: or if the Proteſtant tranſlation of *peſel* were true, it ſhould haue beene *a grauen Image*, not, *any grauen Image*. And this they ſeeme to adde, therby to make the ignorant beleeue that all ſorts of Images whatſoeuer, euen of our Sauiour, and of his Saints, are here forbidden by this generall clauſe, *thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any* grauen Image.

Exod. 20. v. 4.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, to make the text yet more to ſound againſt vs, in the eares of the vulgar, they make it ſay, nor the likeneſſe *of any thing* that is in heauen aboue &c. when it ſhould be according to the hebrew, *col tegumach aſher*, nor any likeneſſe which is in heauen, or verbatim thus, or all and euery likeneſſe *which* is in heauen, not *of any thing* which is in heauen, theſe words *any thing* being added vnto the hebrew text; therby to perſwade the vnlearned, that the likeneſſe of all things in heauen and conſequently of our Sauiour, the Angells, and Saints, are here prohibited: whereas the direct meaning of the text is, to forbidde theſe likeneſſes to be made which appeare viſibly in the materiall heauen to the corporeall eys, as the ſunne, moone, ſtarrs &c. as is cleare Deut. 4. v. 19. which agrees well with the hebrew text, *any likeneſſe which is in heauen*; for at that time, when this commandement was giuen, there was nothing in the imperiall heauen, which had any viſible figure, or could be immediatly expreſſed by any viſible picture, as a true Image of it, for there was nothing then in heauen but God and his holy Angels. But the Engliſh tranſlation, *the likeneſſe of any thing which is in heauen*, is ſubiect to giue occaſion to the ſimple reader (who being taught that our Sauiour with his Saints are in heauen, and that they are forbidden in this com-

commandement to make the likeneſſe *of any thing* which is in heauen, to thinke that they are clearly forbidden to make the likeneſſes or Images, of our Sauiour, & the Saints: and thus the common people of out nation ordinarily vnderſtand it, and their miniſters, and teachers, nuzzle them vp in this errour. Fourthly, yet further to extend the words of this commandement to all ſorts of holy likeneſſes, and ſimilitudes, though in the little catechiſme contayned in their common prayer-booke, they put the commandement thus, *nor the likeneſſe of any thing which is in heauen aboue* &c. which was leſſe intolerable, yet in their Tranſlations from the yeare 1638. they adde another *any* to the text, thus, nor *any* likeneſſe of *any* thing, that they may be ſure to include all. And though in their later Tranſlations, they put the word *any*, *any* Image, *any* thing, in a different letter, to ſignify to the more learned, that it is not in the originall; yet in theyr little Catechiſme they are ſtill put in the very ſame letter with the reſt, as if they were no leſſe in the originall then the other words; which may be noted for an other fraud: and I finde theſe words of Exodus thus tranſlated, in a booke called *the confeſſion of faith*, reprinted at London for the Compaignie of Stationers, 1652. all the words being in the ſame leter: pag. 167. *Thou ſhalt not make vnto thee*

any

any grauen Image, nor any likeneſſe of any thing. Laſtly, for *ſerue*, they haue put *worſhip*, as I haue now declared. So that in theſe few words, *thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen Image, nor any likeneſſe of any thing &c. thou ſhalt not bow down vnto them, nor worſhip them*, are ſix miſtakes, corruptions, or additions to the text. And though ſome of theſe, in themſelues, may be iudged to be of no great moment, and might paſſe amongſt ſuch as with a ſincere meaning ſhould admit ſome of them in their tranſlation, yet in our new Reformiſts, who labour all they can to preſſe this text to common people aboue all others, againſt vs, and about the meaning wherof wee are in great Controuerſy: and who profeſſe, reiecting all other Tranſlations, to ſtand cloſely and ſtrictly to the hebrew text, they are wholy inexcuſable. Now if any illitterate Proteſtant much deuoted to his miniſters, and teachers, and confident of their ſincerity in Tranſlating God's word, ſhould not be brought by what I haue yet ſayd, to beleeue that they would put *Image*, in the place of Idol, and adde other words to the text, which are not in the originall, thereby deceiuing the people: for a cleare and vndeniable proofe of their partiality and deceit in this particular, let him examin the 11. chapter to the Romans, v. 4. and the firſt of the Kings, c. 19. v. 18. and his own

eyes

eyes will tell him that they haue added the word *Image* to the text: for he ſhall find in the Tranſlations of the yeare 1648. and about that tyme, theſe words, Rom. 11. v. 4. *who haue not bowed the knee to the Image of Baal:* where theſe three words, *the Image of*, are added to the text, being neither in the greeke, Latin, nor hebrew: for it ſhould be, *who haue not bowed the knee to Baal.* Not as they haue it, *to the Image of Baal*, the word *Image* being added of purpoſe (as it ſeemes) to create a hatred in the harts of the common people, againſt the vſe of holy Images, ſeeing them ſo expreſly forbidden in their Bibles, euen in the new Teſtament. Now that it may vnanſwerably appeare, that this word *Image* is added to the text, looke into this very text cited by S. Paul, out of the firſt of the Kings, c. 19. v. 18. in their own Bible, and you ſhall find it thus, *all the knees which haue not bowed vnto Baal*, without theſe words, *the Image* of Baal. And that they may vndoubtedly know that theſe words are added to the text in thoſe later Tranſlations, let them peruſe this place in the more ancient Tranſlations, of King Edwards, or Queene Elizabeths tyme, and they mill find this text to the Rom. c. 11. v. 4. without this addition, thus; *which haue not bowed the knee to Baal*, as indeed it ſhould be. And though in the latter Tranſlations, thoſe words *the Image* be put a different print,

Rom. 11. v. 4.

or letter, which may signify to such as are learned, that they are not in the originall, yet this may reasonably be called into question, because the word *of*, which hath a necessary relation to the two fotmer words *the Image*, is put in the same print or letter with Baal, and the rest of the text, which is in the originall; thus, which haue not bowed the knee to *the Image* of Baal; and for what belonges to the vnlearned, who are most in danger to be seduced by such shifts as these, they are commonly ignorant of the reason why some words are in *different or lesse letters*, and all they find in the text, they take to be equally Scripture, and the word of God, as I haue had experience of about a hundred togeather, who all esteemed the words *the Image* to be no lesse Scripture, then the rest of that text, yea I found one who very eagerly and strongly vrged this text, against Images, telling me, and glorying in it, that Images were condemned expresly in the new Testament by these words of S. Paul. Neither can it stand with the rules of true and sincere Translatours, to adde when they please, and when it makes for theyr aduantage, and indangers the deceiuing of the vnlearned in matters of Religion; (as here it doth) by adding certaine words, which are neither found in the hebrew, greeke, nor Latin, (as these are not) though

though it be in a different letter. In the Bibles printed, 1648. at London, by Robert Barker, I find the ſaid words in the ſame letter with the reſt, thus, *which haue not bowed the knee to the Image of Baal*, by which the vnlearned Readers cannot iudge but that theſe words, *the Image of*, are as much the word of God as the reſt, ſeeing them all in the ſame print and leter, with the other words of the text, eſpecially when they marke, that in a hundred other places, the words which are not in the originall are printed in a different leter, from the others in that very Bible. which makes it probable in a high degree, if not certaine, that the maner of printing in this text, is a mere corrupt dealing of our aduerſaries, and a wilfull adding to the word of God, to incenſe the ignorant againſt Images.

M. Fulck, in his Engliſh tranſlation, and commentaries vppon the new Teſtament. Printed at London by the deputies of Chriſtopher Barker, 1589. exuſes this addition by alleadging that in the greeke text here in S. Paul, Rom. 11. 4. the article is of the feminine gender, τῇ Βαάλ. & therefore muſt agree with εἰκόνι, image, beeing alſo of the feminine gender, which word though it be not expreſſed in the greeke, yet ſaith Fulck, it is to be vnderſtood, and ſoe might lawfully be expreſſed in the Engliſh tranſlation. But that

this anſwer is a mere euaſion, grounded vppon a falſe principle, I will preſently make manifeſt for firſt it is not the cuſtome of Greeke authours, ſpeaking of the ſtatues, or Idols of theyr Gods, to expreſſe them in the feminine, as referred to εἰκόνα but in the maſculine article, as referred to the God, whoſe name that ſtatua beares.

Secondly Acts 19. 35. thoſe words which M. Fulck and other Proteſtants vnderſtand, of the ſtatua, or Image of Diana, are not put in greek with the feminine, but with the maſculine or newter gender, ὃ διόπετες, whereby is manifeſt, that when the greeks ſpeake of theyr Idols, and ſtatuas, they referre them, not to εἰκόνα & the feminine, but rather to εἴδωλον, of the newter gender, or ſome ſuch like word.

Thirdly, in the 1. of Kings 19. 18. whence this text of Rom. 11. 4. is taken, the Septuagint haue it in the maſculine gender, τῷ Βαάλ. and yet both this place, and that of S. Paul muſt neceſſarily be vnderſtood to ſpeake of the ſame thing, and in the ſame ſence, which ſeeing the Proteſtants will haue to be only, the ſtatua, or picture of Baal, it muſt needs follow, that the reaſon why S. Paul hath it in the feminine gender, is not becauſe it ſpeakes of that viſible, and artificiall Idol, for 1. Kings 19. 18. ſpeaking alſo of that, hath it in

the

the maſculine gender τῶ Βααλ. This therefore is not the Reaſon, but S. Paul puts it in the feminine and the Septuagint in the maſculine gender, becauſe Baal was a common name to the Idols of the heathens, which weare adored by the Iews, thus nothing is more familiar in the old Teſtament, then to put that word in the plurall number, Baalim, becauſe it was common to many falſe Gods, which weare compriſed in that name. now thoſe Gods ſome were males, and ſome femalls, and ſoe of both genders; amongſt which Aſtarthes Queene, and Goddeſſe of Sidonia, was the moſt famous, where of familiar mention is made in the old Teſtament, ſpeaking of Baalim, and Aſteroth. Seeing therefore that both S. Paul, and the booke of kings ſpeake of a generall worſhipping of Baal through the whol kingdome of Iſrael, which muſt be extended to all theyr falſe Gods whether men or woemen, it might likewiſe be tranſlated truly both in the maſculine gender in the firſt of the kings, and in the feminine in the 11. to the Romains, as comprehending both. And ſoe S. Paul hath it τῆ Βααλ, in the feminine, not in reference to εἰκόνα, Image, as Fulk would haue it, bur in reference to Aſtarthes, or other woemen Goddeſſes, comprehended in that generall word *Baal*, as Catholicque doctours vnderſtand it, for according to this 1. Kings 11. 5. 33.

expoſition, both the old and new Teſtament are eaſily reconciled, but according to Fulk, neyther can the old be here reconciled with the new, nor the new with it ſelfe, as I haue declared. whence appeares, ſeeing this reaſon failes, which Proteſtants ſoly alleadge for theyr defence, that the word Image, is here added to the text, with out any ſufficient reaſon, and ſoe falſely and corruptedly.

I finde the like addition of the word *Image*, Acts 19.35. aboue cited, where though the greek word be of the maſculine gender, (as I haue declared) yet the word *Image* (which is not in the originall as M. Fulk acknowledges) is put into the Engliſh text, thus, *of the Image which came down from Iupiter*, where there was noe reaſon at all to put Image, ſeeing the greeke words are maſculine, but the Reader may eaſily diſcouer by ſuch indirect proceedings as theſe, that it is not the gender, but the generall diſguſt againſt *holy Images*, which cauſed theſe additions, for whether the greek article be maſculine, or feminine, Image muſt come in, as is euident from theſe two texts: Neyther is that which M. Fulk alleadges of any force, for the greek words may be refered, to τέκνον, and be tranſlated, as our vulgar hath it, *Iouis Proles, Iupiters child*, hauing rather relation to the Perſon, then to the Idol of Diana. Or if it be referred to that Idol which was re-

ſerued,

ſerued, with ſoe greate honour in the temple of Epheſus, yet by reaſon of the great ſtupidity, and brutality of the Heathens deſcribed in many places of holy Scripture (as I ſhall here after declare) that very Idol, was held by them to be a true deity, and the liuing Goddeſſe Diana, and therefore they made ſoe loud, and ſtrong acclamations, *magna eſt Diana Epheſiorum*, *great is Diana of the Epheſiens*, who was noe other, then that dull, and dead Idol, which was adored by them in the temple of Epheſus. But though they had been wiſer then the ordinary ſtrayne of Idolaters, and ſoe had eſteemed that Idol, to be a mere repreſentation of theyr Goddeſſe, yet ſeeing that the originall, hath noe word which ſignifies *Image*, but vſes a generall expreſſion, which is indifferent, to the one, or other of theſe explications, why ſhould not the Engliſh, as well as the greek haue only ſayd, *that which came down from Iupiter*, neyther expreſſing *Image*, nor any other determinate thing, if they had as fully intended to follow the originall, without all paſſion againſt holy Images, as they pred-end it?

Iſa. 44. 15. 17. Luc. 19. 3. Oſee 11. 2.

But that I may further lay open how vehemently they were tranſported in the firſt appearance of theyr new Church, againſt the vſe of Images, I will breefly alleadge ſome other places of Scripture wherein theyr tranſ-

lations of the yeares 1562. and 1577. as M. Fulk acknowledges, and 1589. they haue tranſlated the greek words, εἰδωλολατρεία, *worſhippers of Images*, εἴδωλα *Images*. Thus Epheſ. 5. 5. where the greek hath, *Idolater*, theſe trāſlations haue, *a worſhipper of Images*. And Coll. 3. 5. where the greek hath *Idolatry*, they haue *worſhipping of Images*, and the like is Gal. 5. 20. 1. Ioan. 5. 21. for Idoles in greeke they tranſlate *Images*, in the Bible printed, 1562. and though in Fulks teſtament it be tranſlated *Idoles* in the text; yet in the margent he puts, *or Images*. Now how great a difference there is betwixt *an Idol*, and *an Image*, I haue all ready declared, and M. Fulk acknowledges, fol. 456. that *the vſe of our Engliſh ſpeach hath made the name of Idol odious, and of Image indifferent*. whence follows neceſſarily, that the word *Image* according to him may ſignifie noe leſſe a good then a bad repreſentation, but the word *Idol* allways a bad, ſoe that the word *Image*, or *Images* cannot be put abſolutly in thoſe places of Scripture, where they are vniuerſally to be vnderſtood of things bad, or vnlawful; thus therefore, 1. Iohn 5. 2. where the Apoſtle ſaith, *Babes keepe your ſelues from Idoles*, being an indefinite, and ſoe an vniuerſall precept he commands Chriſtians to keepe themſelues from all kinde of *Idoles* what ſoeuer, and ſoe is fitly, and truly expreſſed, by the word *Idoles*, becauſe that word is al-

alwayes taken in our language (euen according to M. Fulk) in an odious, and bad ſignification: but it can neyther fitly, nor truly, be expreſſed by the word *Images* put abſolutly, and without any adjunct, as it is in thoſe firſt ttanſlations of Engliſh Proteſtants, *babes keepe your ſelues from Images*, for then the precept could not be indefinitly, and vniuerſally vnderſtood, as it muſt be, to keepe themſelues *from all Images whatſoeuer*, for all Chriſtians ſhould be here commanded, to keepe themſelues from all monie, becauſe it hath Images vppon it, and the huſband to keepe himſelfe from his wife, becauſe ſhe is an Image of God, nay Chriſtians to keepe themſelues from Chriſt, becauſe he is the *Image* of his father. But if Proteſtants would vſe the word *Image*, in this text, fitly and truly, they muſt haue added ſome adiectiue, to it, which would haue tyed it to ſignifie ſomething which is vniuerſally vnlawfull, thus *Babes keepe your ſelues from falſe Images*, or from *bad Images* &c. but this they refuſed to doe, firſt becauſe there was noe ſuch adiectiue in the originall, and and ſecondly, becauſe the addition of that adiectiue, would haue made the text to haue had not ſoe much as any ſeeming force, againſt the doctrine of the Romain Church, for we ſhould preſently haue anſwered, that our Images are neyther falſe, nor bad but true, and

Mar. 32. 16. Gen. 1 27. 2. Cor. 4. 4,

holy, and soe not forbidden in that place. Thus though the word *desire*, be indifferēt to signifie as wel bad, as good *desires*, yet this would be a very absurd command. *keep your selues from desires*, for that were to oblige one to abstayne from *all desires*, and therefore the Apostle, when he giues a command about desires, he speakes not indefinitly, but expresses by the adiectiue, which he adioynes, what desires he meanes,

1. Pet. 2. 11 *Abstinete vos à carnalibus desiderijs*, *Keepe your selues from carnal desires*, all which are bad and vnlawfull. whence appeares that Protestants, by this theyr translation, make S. Iohn, and the holy Scripture, to deliuer a commande, not only false, and senseless, but euen wicked, and blasphemous; for it must command Christians to keepe themselues from all Images, and consequently, not only from all Koyne, and Company, of men, which are *Images*, but euen from Christ himselfe, who is the *Image* of his eternall father.

The like inconueniences follow, from the other texts now cited, where *Image*, is put absolutly. for *Idoll*. for when the Apostle, Ephes. 5. 5. Reckons vp those hainous sinners, who are excluded (dying without repentance) from the kingdome of heauen, he calls an auaritious man, an *Idolater* in the originall, and the English Protestants, make the text say, *an auaritious man which is a worshipper of Images*, now euery

euery auaritious man is truly called an Idolater, becauſe he commits *ſpirituall idolatry*, in making his gould, his God; but an auaritious man cannot be truly termed a ſpirituall *worſhipper of Images*, abſolutly taken, for that ſuppoſes, that all worſhipping of any Image whatſoeuer is ſinfull, as all auarice is, which notwithſtanding is not only falſe but blaſphemous, for ciuil worſhip exhibited to the Image of ſome lawfull Emperour, is not ſinfull euen according to Proteſtants, and diuine worſhip giuen to our Sauiour, who is the *Image* of his father, is not only not ſinfull, but moſt lawfull and holy.

The like follows, from theyr tranſlation of Gal. 5. 20. where the Apoſtle giuing a catalogue of thoſe capitall ſinnes which vnrepented depriue a ſoul of eternall happineſſe, amongſt many others, names, *Idolorum ſeruitus*, in greeke *Idolatry*, now as all the reſt whenſoeuer they are done; are ſinnes, ſoe whenſoeuer any kinde, or act of Idolatry is committed, it is a ſinne; but the Proteſtant changing Idolatrie, *into worſhipping of Images*, muſt make the Scripture ſay, that as whenſoeuer any fornication, adultery, witchcraft, idolatry, or any other here named, is commited, ſinne is committed, ſoe when any kinde of worſhipping of Images is committed, ſinne is committed, which notwithſtanding is manifeſtly

false, for neyther is the ciuil worship of an Emperours Image a sinne, and much lesse the diuine worship of our Sauiour, who is the Image of his father; Thus is it made euident, that whilst Protestants shew theyr vehement passions against *holy Images*, they make the Scripture to speake not only falsities, but euen blasphemies. which the later Trãslaters hauing obserued, ashamed of soe foul errours, haue corrected (as any one may see) theyr former, and ancienter translations, and haue restored Idoles, *Idolaters*, and *Idolatrie*, to the respectiue texts, which I haue aboue cited. neyther is that which M. Fulk alleadges in defense of those ancient translations, of any force at all, for though the vulgar latin translation, translate the greek εἴδωλον, sometimes *simulacrum*, and some amongst the ancients, not only heathens, but Christians, take that latin word in a good sense, yet according to the acception which it hath through the whol latin Bible, it is neuer taken for any thing saue an Idol: neyther cites M. Fulk, soe much as any one text of Scripture, where simulacrum, is not taken for an Idol: where as the word *Image*, in all languages, is familiarly taken, not only in all authours, both Heathens, and Christians, but also in holy Scripture, for true, lawfull, holy, and diuine Images. Notwithstanding all that I haue sayd in manifest and vndeniable proofe

of

of the falſe tranſlation of the commandement Exod.20.v.4.&c.yet to ſhew how little force theſe texts haue, euen as they ſtand in the Proteſtant Bibles, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen Image* &c. to proue any thing againſt the vſe of holy Images practiſed in the Romain Church;I moſt eaſily anſwer,that if they vnderſtand by *grauen Image* ſuch as are alſo Idoles as it is taken,Iſay.44.17. Pſ.105.19. Pſ 78.5.Iudg.18.where that which v.17.& 18. &20.is called a grauē,& a molten Image,v.24. is called Gods,& in the Proteſtāt Bibles in different other places,as I haue already ſhewed, nay through the whol Proteſtant Bible, the word *grauen Image*, is neuer taken but for an Idol, or a falſe God, for as much I euer could yet diſcouer in it:then I grant that ſuch Images are neither to be *made*,worſhipped,nor ſerued: but this concludes nothing at all againſt the Romain Church, who abhorres, deteſts, and anathematizes all ſuch Images, with the worſhipping, and worſhippers of them.But if they vnderſtand by *grauen Image*, an Image wich is no Idoll, but a true repreſentation of ſome holy perſon now in heauenly bliſſe,ſuch as where the images of the two Cherubins Exodus the 25. then I deny that ſuch *grauen Images* are forbidden, either to be made,or worſhipped, according to the explicatiō already deliuered. Now the reaſon of this

this answer, and distinction is cleare; for if true Images of holy things and persons were forbidden Exod.20. v.4. then that place of Scripture would be contrary to the others, Exodus the 25. which command them: and if all kind of reuerence, respect, and worship be here forbidden to *holy Images*, then this text Exod.20.v.4. would be contrary to the Psal. 98.alias 99.v.5. where we are commanded to worship, or *adore the footstoole of God*, which was nothing but the Arke of the Testament with the two goulden Cherubins in the holy of holyes. *Adore, or worship his footstoole*, saith there holy Dauid; where the very same hebrew word, and phrase is vsed which is in Exod.20. v.4. Some ignorant reader may happily say, that those pictures of the Cherubins Exod.25. were commanded only to the Iewes, and to be vsed in the old law, and so touch not christians any thing. I answer first, the forbidding of Images is also only in the old Testament, Exod.20.v.4. &c. Secondly, that command Exod.25. to make some Images, was brought to shew that all kind of Images were not forbidden, Exod.20.v.4. and consequently, that some images might be lawfully made, and seeing there is now no prohibition forbidding all Images, giuen to Christians, it is lawfull for them, to make holy Images, like to the Cherubins Exod.25.

1.Par.18.2

Seeing

Seeing therefore one place of holy Scripture cannot be contrary to another, for then the one ſhould be falſe, (and ſo could not be the word of God, as it is ſuppoſed to be) they muſt neceſſarily be reconciled and made to agree. And ſeeing the Images of the Cherubs are ſo expreſly commanded to be made by Allmighty God himſelfe, that there is no way to deny or avoyd it, if a chriſtian will reconcile and agree theſe two places, he muſt grant that all kind of Images, euen ſuch as are no more Idols, nor leſſe truly ſacred and holy Images then thoſe Cherubs in the Tabernacle were, are not forbidden in the commandement Exod. 20. v. 4. for if they were, then God ſhould forbid Exod. 20. what he commands Exodus 25. 18. and ſo contradict himſelfe. And what is ſayd about the vnderſtanding of the word *grauen Image*, is reſpectiuely to be applied to the word, *worſhip*: for if all kind of worſhip of Images be forbidden in the commandement Exod. 20. 4. then holy Dauid will contradict Gods command, when he commands the Iſraelites to worſhip his footſtoole, where thoſe Images of the Cherubs were. There is therefore no other poſſible meanes to reconcile thoſe two commands, but by ſaying, that Exod. 20. forbids not all kind, nor can be vnderſtood of that which holy Dauid commandes, but only ſuch a worſhip as is wholy

vnlaw-

vnlawfull, ſuperſtitious, and Idolatrous, wherby the creature is worſhipped and prayed to, as God; and the Image made an Idol, or a falſe God: wich is neither commanded nor allowed in any place of holy Scripture, but alwayes forbidden and condemned. Neither can it be ſayd, that Allmighty God. Pſal. 98. diſpenſed with his command giuen Exod. 2. for if there were forbidden all kind of Images, as being ſuperſtitious and Idolatrous, and iniurious to Gods honour, and ſo of themſelues, or intrinſecally (as the ſchoole ſpeakes) vnlawfull, and all kind of reuerence or worſhip exhibited to them, as in it ſelfe diſhonorable to God, as Proteſtāts vnderſtand this command. Then it cannot be ſayd without moſt high blaſphemy, that God diſpenſed with this command: for then he ſhould diſpence with men to commit ſuperſtition, Idolatry, and diſhonour to him by a command to do them, which were to make him not only authour; but euen fauorer, and commander of ſin.

Neither can it auayle Proteſtants to ſay, (as ſome others haue ſayd) that the making all kind of Images, and all reuerence to them, was forbidden to the Iewes Exod. 20. v. 4. though not vnlawfull in themſelues, by reaſon of the great danger they were in, to be broughr into Idolatry by them, as appeares in the brazen ſerpent, and their perpetuall falling,

falling, vppon euery light occaſion, into Idolatrie. This, I ſay, nothing auayls Proteſtants: firſt, becauſe I haue alreády ſhewed that it is Idolatry only, and Idols, which are here forbidden. Secondly, becauſe if this command of forbidding all kind of Images, and worſhip of them, though good and holy in themſelues, was only directed to the Iewes as long as they were in ſo eminent danger of falling, by reaſon of them, into Idolatry, ſuperſtition &c. then it cannot be preſſed now againſt Chriſtians; whom it touches not, they being not in any ſuch danger of committing heatheniſh Idolatry, but deſtroying it, and rooting it out through the whole world; and ſo it will be lawfull for them to make, and worſhip (according to my former explications) holy Images, as hauing no command to the contrary.

From what I haue now ſayd, will eaſily appeare how little reaſon the Romain Church hath, to blot thoſe words, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any Idol* &c. out of the commandement, as vulgar Proteſtants are made beleeue by a moſt falſe aſperſion of their miniſters: for if they make nothing at all againſt her, as I haue ſhewed, why ſhould ſhe blot them out? But that I may giue a full and cõpleat anſwer to this miſtake of common people, which I haue learned by long experience to be one of

the

the greateſt ſtumblingblocks, that hinders them from imbracing Catholike Religion; becauſe, ſay they, we leaue out the ſecond Commandement: I will breefly cleare this poynt, and conuince euidently, that it is a mere deuiſe to catch the ignorant, hauing neither truth nor ſubſtance in it For firſt, there neuer was yet ſo much as one ſole Bible, of ours in whatſoeuer language, place, tyme, or edition, which hath not theſe words, which Proteſtants call the ſecond commandement, as fully and compleatly as any Proteſtant Bibles haue: and I challenge the beſt verſed amongſt them, to produce one only in the whol world, which hath them not, and that the more ignorant, who vnderſtand Engliſh only, may haue what aſſurance they are capable of in this particular, let them preſſe their miniſters, to ſhew them the Remiſh Bible ſet out by Romain Catholike Diuines: and there Exod. 20. and Deut. 5. they ſhall find, all the ſayd words fully an intyrely.

Secondly, not only in all our Bibles, but in our larger and fuller Catechiſmes, this whole commandement is expreſſed. So Catechiſmus Romanus ſet out by order of the late Councill of Trent, parte 3. pag. 298 n. 8. and Caniſius his Catechiſme, de Charitate & Decalogo 1. q. 5. p. 74. 75. where ſetting down the commandements, he puts the firſt thus: *Non habebis*

habebis Deos alienos coram me: non facies tibi ſculptile, vt adores illud. Thou ſhalt haue no other Gods before me: thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any Idol to adore it: and then cites the commandements all at large, as fully as they ſtand in the Proteſtant Bibles Exod. 20. and Deut. 5. And in an Engliſh Catechiſme, called a Summary of Controuerſies, compoſed by P.C. of the Society of Ieſus, and printed in the yeare 1639. The third edition chap. 3 q. 5. pag. 68. hath it thus: *Thou ſhalt not haue any ſtrange Gods before me: thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen Image to worſhip it.* And in the ſame maner are they ſet down in an other Engliſh Catechiſme, which I haue ſeene and read in a publike auditory of Proteſtants.

The ground therefore of this falſe impoſition, if it may be termed a ground, may happily haue beene ſome ſmall ſhort Catechiſmes made for little children, and new beginners, for the help of their memories, to be learned by hart, wherin this commandement, (as all the reſt of the longer commandements) ſet down Exod. 20. Deut. 5. is abridged and brought to ſo many words as merely ſerue to expreſſe the ſubſtance of them, omitting the reſt, thus. 1. *I am the Lord thy God: thou ſhalt not haue any other Gods before me.* 2. *Thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vayne.* 3. *Remember thou ſanctify the feſtiuall dayes.* 4. *Honour*

thy father, and mother. where not only many words adioyned to the command againſt adoring falſe Gods, or Idols, Exod. 20. Deut. 5. but to the three enſuing alſo, are here for brevity's ſake omitted: ſetting down in few words the ſubſtance, and making no mention of the reaſons and amplifications found in Exodus, and Deuteronomy, leaſt, were they all ſett at large, as they are there, both the memory of yong children might be ouercharged, and their weake vnderſtandings confounded, not being able to diſtinguiſh the ſubſtance of the command, from the reaſons and amplifications of it.

Now if we deliuered the commandements with this preface, as Proteſtants do in their common prayer booke, *The ſame which God ſpake in the 20. chapter of Exodus, ſaying* &c. we were obliged to put them all word for word as they are found there: For otherwiſe the commandements would not be anſwerable to the Title. But ſeeing we find them in other places of Scripture, ſet down in a much briefer manner then they are there; and find no precept neither in Scripture, nor in the Church, to deliuer them to Chriſtians as they are deliuered in Exod. 20. and Deut. 5. rather then in other places; our aduerſaryes can no more condemne vs of falſefying them when we put them briefer, then they can the holy

Scrip-

Scripture it ſelfe for abbreuiating them more in other places then they are in Exodus now cited, and Leuiticus.

That they are thus abbreuiated in Scripture, is manifeſt Leuit. 19. v. 1. 2. 3. *And the Lord ſpake vnto Moyſes, ſaying; ſpeake vnto all the congregation of the children of Iſrael, and ſay vnto them; yee ſhall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy; yee ſhall feare euery man his father and his mother, and ſhall keepe my ſabbaths: I am the Lord your God: yee ſhall not turne vnto Idols, nor make molten Gods, I am the Lord your God* &c. where that which our aduerſaryes account the ſecond commandement, is put euen ſhorter then many of our catechiſmes, haue it: *Turne not your ſelues vnto Idols, nor make vnto your ſelues molten Gods*: as it is in Exod. 20. v. 23. *Yee ſhall not make vnto your ſelues Gods of ſiluer*: neither ſhall yee *make Gods of gould.*

Neither indeed is it any way conuenient to deliuer the commandements publikely and generally to Chriſtian people word for word as they ſtand Exod. 20. Leuitit. 26. becauſe therby they are indangered, either to take ſunday to be ſaturday, or the Iewiſh Sabbath; or muſt hold themſelues obliged to obſerue Saturday with the Iewes, that alone being *dies Sabbati*, the Sabbath day, wherin only, God reſted after the creation of the world; which only he alſo Sanctifyed, and commanded to

be kept, as clearly appeares by the words of the commandement: ſoe that it is not any ſeuenth day, or one indeterminately euery weeke, which God commands to be kept holy in this precept, but one only, and determinately, that is the ſame ſeuenth day, where in God reſted from the worke of the creation, as appeares, Gen.2.1.2.3. *Et benedixit diei ſeptimo, & ſanctificauit illum, quia in ipſo ceſſauerat ab omni opere ſuo quod creauit Deus vt faceret. And God bleſſed the ſeuenth day and ſanctified it, becauſe that in it he had reſted from all his workes, which God created and made.* now it is moſt euident, that God reſted only, vppon one determinate day, and that, noe other then the Iewiſh Sabbath, or Saturday. or if they vnderſtand well what day is meant in the commandement, they muſt needs be ſcandalized, to ſee a commandement vniuerſally deliuered to them of keeping the Iewiſh Sabbath, which is, and euer was, Saturday, and yet neuer obſerued by any of them, but Sunday in place of it.

Hence therefore we ſee in generall, that it is very inconuenient to propoſe Gods commandements publikely to Chriſtians word for word as they ſtand in Exodus: and ſo wee can neuer be iuſtly condemned if we put ſome of them as they are more briefly deliuered in other places of Scripture, or now to be in obſeruance amongſt Chriſtians.

But

But there is an other poynt boggeled at chiefly by the ignorant, about the diuiſion of Gods cõmandements. *Yee* (obiect they againſt vs) *put the two firſt commandements into one, and diuide the laſt into two.* I anſwere, that a Catholike ſeeing their diuiſion, may with much more reaſon tell Proteſtants, *yee put the two laſt commandements into one, and diuide the firſt into two.* Briefly therefore to cleare this poynt, it is to be noted: that though it be expreſly declared in Scripture that Gods commandements were ten in number, and written in two tables, yet through the whole Bible neuer is it declared which is the firſt, ſecond, third &c. nor ſo much as one word ſpoken concerning the diuiſion of them: but this was left, either to tradition, or to the prudent determination of Doctours: ſo that, howſoeuer they are prudently diuided, there will be nothing contrary to Scripture, ſo long as the whol ſubſtance be expreſſed, and the number of them be obſerued.

Hence, in and euen before S. Auguſtins tyme, (as he witneſſes) there was a double diuiſion of the commandements amongſt Chriſtians: ſome diuiding them as we doe; and others as our aduerſaryes. Yet both S. Auguſtine himſelfe, q. 71. in Exod. and S. Hierome Comment. in Pſalm. 32. and Clemens Alexandrinus lib. 6. Stromatum, follow our diuiſion,

S. Auguſtin prouing it very largly to be the better, and putting in the firſt commandement, *Idol*, not *Image*; and *ſerue*, not *worſhip*; and S. Hierome ſetting down the three commandements conteyned in the firſt table, as ſhort, or ſhorter then any of our Catechiſmes doe: and from them euen to our tymes, it ſeemes to haue beene the receiued diuiſion, at leaſt in the weſterne Church, and ſhould haue beene followed by thoſe of our nation, (who euer before the breach, were eſteemed a part of it, and yet pretend to be ſo) had not the ſpirit of contradiction againſt the Romain Church induced them to the contrary.

Item Lutherus impr. Ienæ 1589. pag. 117. Et Hus Norinbergæ 1558. pag. 30.

Now as we haue authority, ſo haue we ſolid reaſon to prefer this diuiſion, before that of our aduerſaryes: for certaine it is that each different commandement forbids a different maine ſin; ſo that neither are we to make two forbid one capitall ſin, nor one, two ſinnes. This our diuiſion ſtrictly obſerues, but that of our aducrſaryes, not ſo: for their two firſt commandements forbid only the ſin of Idolatry, as being the capitall ſin forbidden in them both, and ſo can be but one commandement, as we put them: and their laſt prohibites two maine diſtinct ſinnes, the deſire of adultery, *thou ſhalt not couet thy neighbours wife*, and the deſire of theft, *thou ſhalt not couet thy neigbours goods* &c. which are as different in thought,

thought, as adultery and ſtealing are in act: if therefore, as they acknowledge, there be two commandements to forbid them; in all reaſon there muſt be two to forbid the deſires of them; and this reaſon is preſſed by S. Auguſtin in the place alleadged.

It is further moſt manifeſt, that theſe which are made two commandements by the Proteſtants, can be noe more then one and the ſame commandement, for in the 2. of Kings 17. v. 35. the whole ſubſtance, of that which Proteſtants call the ſecond commandement is put in one ſingle ſentẽce, togeather with the firſt in theſe words, *you ſhall not feare ſtrange Gods, neyther ſhal you worſhip them, neyther ſhall you ſerue them, neyther ſhall ſacrifize to them.* now, what is meant by thoſe ſtrange Gods, is declared, v. 40. and the 41. *How be it they did not harken but they did after theyr former maner, ſoe theſe nations feared the Lord, and ſerued theyr grauen Images.* whence it is euident, that that which is called *ſtrange Gods*, v. 35. is called *grauen Images*, v. 41. and ſoe to forbid the ſeruice, and worſhip of *ſtrange Gods*, which is in the Proteſtants firſt commandement, and to forbid the ſeruice, and worſhip of *grauen Images*, is the ſame command, as forbidding the ſame thing. Hence alſo appeares, that the word *Pheſel*, vſed Exod. 20. 4. and is alſo vſed here v. 41. ſignifies an Idol, or a *ſtrange God*, as I haue often ſaid: and

noe leſſe is manifeſt from theſe words, that the ſeruice which is here mentioned, to thoſe *grauen Images, Pheſelim*, v.41. was to *feare them*, and *ſacrifice to them*, as ſtrange Gods, v.35. And, moreouer thus theſe which are here called ſtrange Gods, v.35. were materiall Idoles, or as Proteſtants terme them *grauen Images*, is moſt cleare, v.33. *They feared the Lord, and ſerued their own Gods after the maner of the nations, whom they carried away from thence*, for they could not carry with them, any other Gods, ſaue ſuch as theſe, from one place to an other.

That nothing may be wanting to the full ſatisfaction of the Reader, I haue here adioyned, the hebrew words as they ſtand in the originall of this text which is ſo violently, and frequently preſſed againſt vs.

Exod.20.v.4.

לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ פֶסֶל וְכָל־תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל וַאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתָּחַת וַאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם מִתַּחַת לָאָרֶץ׃ לֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תָעָבְדֵם׃

Deut.5.v.5.

לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ פֶסֶל כָּל תְּמוּנָה

Which words out of what I haue allready alleadged, may be thus tranſlated.

Thou

Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe, an Idol, any figure which is in heauen aboue, or in the earth beneath or in the water vnder the earth, thou ſhalt not bow, down to them, nor ſerue them. or thus:

Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe an Idol, of any figure which is in heauen aboue; Bible 1629.
for the Proteſtants themſelues, giue the like tranſlation to the like phraſe, Deut. 4. v. 16. and Pagninus giues for the firſt ſignification, of Moun, or Temounach, figuram, a figure, not only artificiall, but naturall, or apparent, as when angels appeare, in the figures of men. Deut. 4. 15. Pſal. 17. 15. *I ſhal be ſatisfied when I awake with thy likeneſſe, Temounach,* which is nothing but the ſubſtance, and eſſence of God, conceiued clearly in our vnderſtanding, as we commonly ſay in our language, let him appeare in his likeneſſe, that is in his own ſhape, figure, or perſone.

Soe that the meaning of theſe words as they ly in the 20. of Exod. and 5. of Deutronomy compared with the 2. of Kings 17. where a ſtrange God, & a grauen Image are the ſame thing, as I ſhewed iuſt now, can only haue this ſence, that Allmighty God here forbids, that we ſhould haue any ſtrange Gods before him, that is, that we ſhould not make an Idol, according to any viſible figure which wee ſee eyther in the materiall heauens, or in the earth, or in the waters, worſhipping, and

ſeruing, that is, fearing thoſe very Idoles, and ſacrifizing to them, as to things indewed, with life, power, vnderſtanding, & diuinity. which horrible Idolatry is as farre from the doctrine of the Romain Church, (which in the beginning of this controuerſie, I cited out of the cleare words of the Council of Trent) as darckeneſſe is from light.

To correſpond to the deſire of other Readers, I haue alſo thought it conuenient to cite the Greeke text, of the 70. Interpreres.

Exodus 20. v. 4.

Οὐ ποιήσεις ἑαυτῷ εἴδωλον, οὐδὲ παντὸς ὁμοίωμα, ὅσα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ὅσα ἐν τῇ γῇ κάτω, καὶ ὅσα ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν ὑπὸ κάτω τῆς γῆς, οὐ προσκυνήσεις αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ μὴ λατρεύσεις αὐτοῖς.

Where they doe not only tranſlate it *ſeruie*, but ſhew that it is a ſeruice proper to God, which is here forbidden, οὐδὲ μὴ λατρεύσεις αὐτοῖς, and thou ſhalt not ſerue them with a diuine or higheſt ſeruice, as I ſhewed in the begining out of Scripture to be vnderſtood by the greeke word λατρεύω and λατρεία, and S. Auguſtin q. 61. vppon Geneſis confirmes the ſame.

Now that the difference betwixt *worſhipping*, and *ſeruing*, may be better vnderſtood; and that *worſhip*, may in ſome true ſence be attributed

buted to things inanimate and without knowledge, but not *ſeruice*; the Proteſtants themſelues grant that ciuill *worſhip* may be giuen to te chayre of ſtate, or picture, of a temporall King; but *ſeruice* only to his Royall perſon, not to his picture; ſo that no man can be rightly ſayd to ſerue the Kings chayre of ſtate or his picture, but to ſerue the Kinge, and yet they may be, and are ſayd truly, to worſhip or honour, by ſome externall ſigne, his chayre of ſtate, &c. In the very ſame manner with proportion, one may truly be ſayd to worſhip or reuerence the picture of our Sauiour, or his Saints, as things known and eſteemed to be (as indeed they are) wholy dead, and inanimate, without any power att all, in themſelues, to heare vs, or helpe vs, merely becauſe they repreſent thoſe holy perſons whoſe pictures they are: but we cannot be ſayd in any true or proper ſence, *to ſerue* them, ſo long as we make only this eſteeme of them. And hence it is, that the reuerence or worſhip wich we yeeld to holy Images, is not intended to them, or to begge any fauour of them, or thinke that any help can be conferred vppon vs by any power in them, and no Romain Catholike is to doe otherwiſe. But we pray before them, that we hauing them before our eyes, may better and more attentiuely thinke of thoſe whom they repreſent,

Concil. Trid. ſeſſ. 24. c. 3.

presem,and the reuerence and honour which we giue to them, is in a double respect ; first we giue them that reuerence which is due to holy things, dedicated, and consecrated , or tending to the worship of God , as are altars, holy vessells,and such like;and in this respect we giue them no more honour,nor worship, then the Protestants vse to doe to Churches in England , by keeping their hats of,kneeling &c. for as they doe that to such places, rather then to theyr own houses,because they are the houses of God ; so doe we reuerence holy Images , because they are holy things, putting vs in remembrance of God , and heauenly things.Neither doe we this without warrant of holy Scripture : for Iosue 5. v.15. an Exod.3. v.9. Iosue and Moyses are commanded to put of their shoes because the earth was holy wheron they stood ; which was nothing but a reuerence vnto that earth made holy by the presence of God , or an Angell: and if a piece of ground must haue beene reuerenced because it was holy , why not all other things,which are consecrated or referred to the worship and reuerence of God?

The second respect which we haue in worshipping holy Images , is particular to them as they are Images and representations of other things:and in this respect, all the acts of

of externall reuerence or worſhip, which we exhibite to them, is not directed to them, as the ende or reaſon of our worſhip, but it is only to paſſe by meanes of them, to that which is repreſented by them; where it wholy and only reſts, as in a thing intended to be worſhipped by it. Thus when wee doe any reuerence to an Image of the Virgin Mary, reſpecting it merly as her Image, the reuerence or worſhip paſſes by meanes of that to the B. Virgin; and there only reſts and terminates it ſelfe; and it is impoſſible to honour an Image, as an Image, otherwiſe: for being in its proper nature, nothing elſe but a repreſentation of ſuch or ſuch a perſon, or thing all which is done to it, is intended by it to that which it repreſents: neither is it poſſible, at leaſt in this life, to giue any honour to God, or his Saints, otherwiſe then by meanes of one Image or other eyther corporall, of ſpirituall: for it is impoſſible to honour or worſhip any thing vnleſſe we thinke vppon that which we worſhip: and it is impoſſible to thinke of any thing vnleſſe there be framed in our heads, or vnderſtandings a repreſentation of that thing which we thinke of: now nothing can be repreſented, without ſome repreſentation, as is cleare, and euery repreſentation is an Image and likeneſſe of that thing which is repreſents. So that we always honour whomſoeuer

we

we honour, through that Image of our thought, which we frame of them; and all our acts of honour of worſhip paſſe through that interiour imagination or thought which we haue framed, to the obiect or thing, which is repreſented by it. Now for the better help of our imagination, or internall thought, we vſe ſome externall thing as an obiect of our ſenſes, to excite vs to ſuch thoughts, and keepe vs more liuely and fixedly in them: thus words and diſcourſes (wherin the things which we intend to worſhip, are deſcribed, or ſignifyed) help vs to a more ſtrong and attentiue thought of them, and are the Images of the eare; through which as through repreſentations of what we worſhip, we giue honour to that which they repreſent to vs: thus pictures and images, paynted or carued, help the eye to frame a more full and ferme imagination, or thought of that we worſhip; now we haue warrant enough in holy Scripture, to giue honour, or adoration, to ſuch things as helpe vs to thinke of God, and haue a reuerence giuen them to that end.

Thus in the 98. Pſalme alias the 99. v. 5. *Adorate ſcabellum pedum eius, worſhip or adore his foot ſtoole*, which was nothing but the Arke of the Teſtament, as all agree, and notwithſtanding here is a command to worſhip it. Your Engliſh tranſlation to auoyd the force of theſe words,

words, tranſlates it in this manner *worſhip at his footſtoole*: as though indeed no worſhip at all were commanded to be giuen *to it*; but only that God were to be worſhipped *at it*. But this is another manifeſt fraud: for the hebrew word, and greeke is the very ſame here with that of the 20. of Exodus, *lo* tiſhtachaue lachem, and here, ve *hiſhtacauon la hathom ragluau*. and in Exod. 20. becauſe they will exaggerate the command againſt holy Images, it muſt be, *thou ſhalt not bow down vnto them*: and here, Pſalm. 98. v. 5. becauſe they feare that the people might gather from hence, that creatures, and Images, (ſuch as were the two Cherubins in the tabernacle, putting vs in mynd of the true God, were to be worſhipped, it muſt be with them, *worſhip at his footſtoole*. Thus they change and chop the words of holy Scripture, to ſerue their own turnes, at their pleaſure ſo far, that euen two Pſalmes before Pſalm. 97. v. 7. they tranſlate the ſame word and phraſe in hebrew, *worſhip him all yee Gods*: and here it muſt not be *worſhip his footſtoole*, but, *worſhip at his footſtoole*: nay in hundreds of other places of Scripture, where the ſame word and manner of ſpeech is in the Hebrew either attributed to God, or men, or Idols, or falſe Gods, they tranſlate *worſhip* or *worſhip not*, the things forbidden or commanded: only here forſooth, becauſe it makes

quite

quite againſt them, if it be truly tranſlated, they will needs haue it, *worſhip at his footſtoole:* but both the hebrew, and greeke, and the Septuaginta, and the ancient vulgar Tranſlation haue it plaine enough *bow down vnto his footſtoole*, or, *worſhip his footſtoole.* whence I gather, that it is warranted in holy Scripture, to giue reuerence and worſhip as I before explicated, to ſuch things as put vs in mynd of Allmighty God, and conſequently to holy Images. And as this is cleare in Scripture, ſo is the practiſe thereof no leſſe cleare euen amongſt Proteſtants: for what more common amongſt the more moderate of them, then to make a profound adoration at the name of Ieſus? which is nothing but a repreſentation, or Image of our Sauiour, to the eare: which practice ſeeing it is grounded (according to them) in thoſe words, Phil. 2. 10. *In the name of Ieſus euery knee ſhall bow*, and thoſe words, extend themſelues as much to that ſacred name ſeen by the eye, as heard by the eare, brings in a neceſſity, of granting a religious worſhip, to that moſt diuine name, when we ſee it eyther printed in a booke, or carued in a ſtone &c. what worſhip ſoeuer therefore, a well minded Proteſtant ſhould iudge to be giuen to that name thus ingrauen, with out all ſuperſtition or Idolatry, or breach of this commandement, let him giue the ſame to any Image of our Sauiour,

and

and in the ſame maner, or at leaſt iudge that the like may lawfully be giuen to it, and noe more in this point will be required of him, to be eſteemed conformable to the doctrine, and practice of the Romane church. & what more generally practiſed before theſe troubles then to kneele in receiuing the cõmunion, which is only a reſemblance or likeneſſe of our Saiuiours Paſſion with them? and ſo giuing the reuerence of kneeling to it, they properly worſhip an Image, or ſimilitude, or remembrance, of our Saiuiours death. And if any ſhould anſwer that they worſhip not the bread and wine in the Lords ſupper, nor kneele to them, but only to God when they receiue them, I demand preſently, whether they exhibite any kind of reuerence to the bread and wine as a repreſentation of our Lords Paſſion, or no? if they anſwer that they giue none at all to them: why then doe they make an exteriour ſhew, and that by way of command and obligation, of exhibiting reuerence and reſpect to thoſe ſignes, ſeeing that in the exteriour, none who ſee them, can iudge that they giue not ſome reuerence euen to them? againe, if they giue no reuerence at all to them, what greater reſpect doe they beare to the Lords ſupper, then they doe to their own in their houſes? ſo that if a zealous brother would kneele to God at the ſame tyme

when he eates his ſupper, he whould ſhew as much reſpect to a brown loafe, as he does to the Lords ſupper when he kneeles only to God, in receiuing it. And yet further, if one who goes to their communion, had no maw to adore God at that tyme, but ſhould put it of to ſome other, when he found himſelfe more moued by the ſpirit, why could not he receiue ſitting, or ſtanding, and that without any externall reuerence at all, to what he receiues viſibly?

Nay how could he in conſcience receiue kneeling or ſhewing any externall reuerence? If they anſwer that they exhibit ſome reuerence, to the externall ſignes, as repreſentations of our Lords death; I demand, whether it be a ciuill or a religious reuerence: to ſay it is a ciuil reuerence, were abſurd: for that is in matters of ſtate and ciuill authority only; and this is in matter of Religion. If they ſay that it is a religious reuerence, then I haue my intent, that euen Proteſtants doe exhibite Religious reuerence to ſignes, figures. and repreſentations of our Sauiour, no leſſe then Catholikes: and then I demand further, by what externall ſigne they make profeſſion of ſuch a reuerence to the ſignes of their communion: certainly they will find no other which ſhewes it more clearly and fully, then their kneeling; or whatſoeuer they name, it

is

is an externall exhibition of religious reuerence, which is nothing but worſhip in a true and Chriſtian ſenſe: whence appeares that Proteſtants themſelues are guilty of what they accuſe vs, that is, of giuing woiſhip to an Image or figure, of our Sauiour dying vppon the croſſe for vs. That which I haue anſwered to the 20. of Exodus, is in like manner applyable to the 26. of Leuiticus, v. 1. and to the 6. v. 73. for they ſpeak only of Idols, and falſe Gods: from which, all Roman Catholikes abhorre far more then Proteſtants.

It is not my intention here to enter into any ſchoole queſtions, which can neyther eaſily be made plaine enough to be rightly conceiued, by all thoſe whom I intend to informe in this treatis, nor are they neceſſary to be known by all Catholicques, nor if they were known, is it neceſſary to beleeue them. So long therefore, as the doctrine of the Council of Trent cited in the beginning of this controuerſie is beleeued and obſerued, noe more will or can be required, (for ſoe much as belongs to this point) of any one who eyther is, or intends to be, a Child of the Roman Church. which doctrine is not only without all danger, but euen without all poſſibility of Idolatrie: for ſeeing an Idolatrous worſhip muſt acknowledge *a diuine power*, and vertu in that which it worſhips, and the Council

expreſſely theaches that noe ſuch *diuine power* is to be acknowledged in any *Image*, it is impoſſible to follow this doctrine, and to commit Idolatrie in the worſhip we giue to any Image, all therefore which is required to vnite a Proteſtant in this particular to the doctrine of the Roman Church, is only this, that he beleeue noe more that there is eyher life, vertu, or diuinity in any Image, then he now beleeues there is in the name of IESVS ſpoaken or written; that he put noe more confidence, nor hope in the picture, then he now puts in the name; that he pray noe more to the picture, then he now prayes to that name, if kneeling before the name of IESVS grauen vppon ſome ſtone, he pray to our Sauiour: but as he now puts of his hat and boweth his knee or body, when he ſees or heares that name, he hold it lawfull to exhibit the ſame reuerence when one ſees the picture of our Sauiour, and as he may now kiſſe that ſacred name in deuotion to our Sauiour, ſoe he hold it lawfull to kiſſe our Sauiours picture in deuotion to him, or in his regard.

If a Proteſtant ſhould demande, whether there be as cleare proofs of Scripture for the worſhip of Images, as there are for the worſhipping the name of IESVS, I anſwer there are. That ſome Images may be lawfully made,

is

is cleare in the Brrazon ſerpent, Num. 21.8.9. That they may lawfully be put in places dedicated to the ſeruice of God, is euident in the two cherubins of gould, Exod. 25.18. That they may haue a reference to diuine ſeruice, and be ordinances belonging to it, is manifeſt Hebr. 9.1.5. That it is lawfull to exhibite ſome worſhip to them, is all ready proued, Pſ. 99.5. *Adore his footſtoole.* That the worſhip which is done to the Image of another, tends as much to his honour whoſe Image it is, as the worſhip done to his name, tends to the honour of him whoſe name it is, is vndeniably prouued, Reu. 13.v.15.16.17. *And he had power to giue life to the Image of the beaſt, that the Image of the beaſt ſhould both ſpeake, and cauſe that as many as would not worſhip the Image of the beaſt ſhould be killed; and he cauſeth all both ſmall and greate, rich and pore, free and bond, to receiue a marke in theyr right hand, or in theyr foreheads: and that noe man might buy or ſall ſaue he who had the marke or the name of the beaſt, or the number of his name.* whence is manifeſt, that the worſhip of *the Image*, of this accurſed creature, tended to his honour, otherwiſe he would neuer haue compelled men to worſhip it, and that he was houored noe leſe in this, if not more, then in carijng his *marke*, and *his name*. which can be deduced from no other principle then this, that all worſhip done proportionally to the Image, is

an honour to him who is repreſented by it, and conſequently, that in this our Sauiour and the Saints are honoured as truly as any other in theyr Images.

If any Proteſtant, demand farther whether there be any expreſſe command in the new Teſtament, to worſhip holy Images. I anſwer there is noe expreſſe command. If it ſhould be replied, that nothing is to be held, or practized by Chriſtians which is not ſet down in expreſſe words in the new Teſtament. I anſwer that that is manifeſtly vntrue, and muſt be confeſſed to be ſoe euen by Proteſtants themſelues, for they can neuer find any expreſſe mention in the new Teſtament: that nothing is to be beleeued, or practized lawfully by Chriſtians, ſaue that which is expreſſed in the new Teſtament, 2. that any churches were made or to be made amongſt Chriſtians, diſtinct from dwelling houſes, 3. that fonts for baptiſme were put in thoſe churches, 4. that childeren were euer actually baptiſed in thoſe fonts, 5. that God-fathers, and God-mothers were to be vſed in Baptiſme of childeren, 6. that any ſpirituall kindred ariſes by vertu of Baptiſme, betwixt thoſe God-fathers, and God-mothers, on the one ſide, and the childeren Baptized, & theyr Parents reſpectiuely on the other. If therefore none of thoſe can be found mentioned expreſſely in the new

Teſta-

Teſtament, with what ſhew of reaſon, can Proteſtants demand, that the worſhip of Images, ſhould be mentioned in the new Teſtament, ſeeing they practice theſe particulars, noe leſſe, then we the worſhip of Images? But in theſe, and ſuch like religious practices, it is ſufficient (euen according to the Proteſtant Principle of ſole Scripture) that eyther there be expreſſe mention made of them, eyther commanding or allowing them in the old Teſtament, which is neuer reuoked or diſſallowed in the new (as is that of the worſhip of Images) or at leaſt, that the lawfullneſſe of them, can be deduced, from the old, or new Teſtament, by a good conſequence, drawn according to the rules of right reaſon, as the worſhip of Images is manifeſtly, from the 13. of the Reuel. now cited, for if the worſhip of the Image tend to the honour of him who is repreſented by it, (as is there euident) and that it is lawfull to doe all that which tends to the honour of our Sauiour, then it follows ineuitably, that the worſhip of his Image, is lawfull, and the like is of the Images of Saints.

Thus haue I indeauored to diſcouer the different miſtakes of Proteſtants, in the texts of Scripture cited by them againſt the vſe of holy Images, taught, and peactized in the Romane Church, and with all the ſtrange miſ-

tranſlations inuented by them, to make holy Scripture ſpeake to the vulgar, againſt the doctrine, and practice of the Romane Church in this particular. and this may ſſuffice for the ſecond Controuerſie.



THE

THE THIRD CONTROVERSIE

Concerning Iustification.

The Doctrine of the Roman Church deliuered in the Council of Trent, touching this Point.

Sess.6. can.1.

SI quis dixerit, hominem suis operibus, quæ vel per humanæ naturæ vires, vel per legis doctrinam fiunt, absque diuina per Iesum Christum gratiâ, posse iustificari coram Deo; Anathema sit.

It any one shall say, that a man can be iustified by his workes, which are done by the force of humaine nature, or by the doctrine of the law, without diuine grace through our Lord Iesus Christ; let him be accursed.

Ibidem. can.2.

Si quis dixerit ad hoc solùm diuinam gratiam per Iesum Christum dari, vt facilius homo iustè viuere ac vitam æternam promereri

possit; quasi per liberum arbitrium vtrumque, sed ægrè tamen & difficulter possit; anathema sit.

If any one shall say that diuine grace through Iesus Christ is giuen only to this end, that a man may more eatily liue iustly, and deserue eternal life, as if he could doe both, though with labour and difficulty, by his freewill; let him be accursed.

Ibidem. can. 3.

Si quis dixerit, sine præueniente Spiritus sancti inspiratione, atque eius adiutorio, hominem credere, sperare, diligere, aut pœnitere posse sicut oportet, vt ei iustificationis gratiâ conferatur; anathema sit.

If any one shall say, that without the preuenting inspiration of the holy Ghost, and his assistance, a man can beleeue, hope, loue, and repent, as he should doe to haue the grace of iustification bestowd vppon him; let him be accursed.

Here I demand vppon what ground the 13 of the 39 English Protestant Articles, speakes thus of the scoole men of the Roman Church, *Workes done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his spirit are not pleasant to God, for as much as they spring not of faith in Iesu Christ, neyther doe they make men meet to receiue grace,*

grace, or (as the ſchoole Authors ſay) deſerue grace of Congruity. I would gladly haue thoſe ſchoole Authours named and cited, who affirme, contrary to the expreſſe words of the Council of Trent, ſo great a ſemi-Pelagian Hereſie, as this is whereof they are here accuſed. And if none attall can be produced, how great an vntruth is conteyned in this article, where it is ſaid, not *as ſome of the ſchoole Authours*, but, *as the ſchoole Authours ſay*, that is, eyther vniuerſally, or commonly affirme; whence may clearly be collected, that thoſe new Prelates and Doctours, who compoſed thoſe 39 articles, which haue been (euer ſince they were compoſed) eſteemed the ſumme and ſubſtance of the Proteſtant Religion, and faith in England, were eyther groſly ignorant, in the doctrine of the ſchoole Authours, and exceeding temerarious in affirming that of them, which they neuer vnderſtood, or inſufferably deceiptfull, and malitious, in accuſing them (againſt theyr own knowledge and conſcience) of holding generally an erronr, which not ſoe much as any one of them euer held, but the quite contrary.

Conc. Trid. ibidem cap. 8.

Cùm verò Apoſtolus dicit iuſtificari homi- Rom. 8.
nem per fidem & gratis, ea verba in eo ſenſu intelligenda ſunt, quem perpetuus Eccleſiæ Catho-

Catholicæ conſenſus tenuit, & expreſſit; vt ſcilicet per fidem ideo iuſtificari dicamur, quia fides eſt humanæ ſalutis initium, fundamentum, & radix omnis iuſtificationis: ſine quâ
Hebr. 11. impoſſibile eſt placere Deo, & ad filiorum eius conſortium peruenire: gratis autem iuſtificari ideo dicamur; quia nihil eorum quæ iuſtificationem præcedunt, ſiue fides, ſiue opera, ipſam
Rom. 11. iuſtificationis gratiam promeretur; ſi enim gra-
Epheſ. 2. tia eſt, iam non ex operibus, alioquin, vt idem
Trid. 6. Apoſtolus inquit, gratia iam non eſt gratia.

When the Apoſtle ſaith that a man is iuſtified by fayth and gratis, or freely, thoſe words are to be vnderſtood in that ſence, which the perpetuall conſent of the Catholicque Church allwayes held, and expreſſed; to wit, that we are ſaid to be iuſtified by faith, becauſe faith is the beginning of mans ſaluation, the foundation, and roote of all iuſtification: without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, and to come into the number, of his childeren. But we are ſaid to be iuſtified gratis, becauſe none of theſe things which goe before iuſtification, whether it be faith, or workes, deſerue the grace of iuſtification; for if it be grace, it is not of workes, otherwiſe, as the ſame Apoſtle ſays, grace would not be grace.

Conc.

Conc. Trid. ibidem. cap. 10.

Sic ergo iuſtificati, & amici Dei, ac domeſtici facti, euntes de virtute in virtutem, renouantur, vt Apoſtolus inquit, de die in diem, & exhibendo ea arma iuſtitiæ in ſanctificationem, per obſeruantiam mandatorum Dei, & Eccleſiæ, in ipſa iuſtitia per Chriſti gratiam acceptâ, cooperante fide bonis operibus creſcunt, atque magis iuſtificantur, ſicut ſcriptum eſt, *Qui iuſtus eſt iuſtificetur adhuc.* Pſal. 83. 2. Cor. 4. Coll. 3. Rom. 6. Apoc. vlt.

Being therefore thus iuſtified, and made the friends, and of the houſhold of God, going on from vertu, to vertu, they are renewed, as the Apoſtle ſaith, from day to day and vſing thoſe armes of iuſtice to ſanctification, by the obſeruance, of the commandements of God, and the Church, theyr faith cooperating with theyr good workes, they increace through the grace of Chriſt, in the iuſtice which they haue receiued; and are iuſtified more and more, as is it written, *he who is iuſt, let him be iuſtified ſtill.*

Conc. Trid. ibidem. can. 9.

Si quis dixerit, ſola fide impium iuſtificari, ita, vt intelligat nihil aliud requiri, quod ad iuſticationis gratiam conſequendam cooperetur, & nulla ex parte neceſſe eſſe eum ſuæ voluntatis

luntatis motu præparari, atque diſponi; anathema ſit.

If any one ſhall ſay, that a wicked man is iuſtified by faith only, ſoe that he meanes that nothing els is required, which may cooperate to the obtayning the grace of Iuſtification, and that it is noe way neceſſary that he be prepared, and diſpoſed by the motion of his will; let him be accurſed.

From theſe authorities of the Council, it is manifeſt, that in this matter of Iuſtification, the Church of Rome, theaches, 1. that noe workes done by the mere naturall force of our freewill; 2. nor by the ſole doctrine or knowledge of the diuine law, can iuſtifie a ſinner in the ſight of God. Can. 1. 3. That noe vniuſt perſone, can without the preuenting inſpiration of the holy Ghoſt, doe any thing (as it ſhould be done) to obteyne, the grace of iuſtification. can. 3. 4. That neyther faith, nor workes, done by the inſpiration of the holy Ghoſt, before Iuſtification, can merit Iuſtification, for it is a free grace of God, giuen not of workes, but by the ſole mercy of God, and for the ſole merits of Chriſt. cap. 8. 5. That though the iuſtification of a ſinner cannot be merited, yet a ſoul may be diſpoſed, & prepared to inſtification, by acts inſpired by the holy Ghoſt. c. 6. 6. That we are not thus diſpoſed by faith only, but alſo by other good motions of our

our will, preuented and assisted by the grace of God.can.9. 7.That being thus freely iustified,& become the childeren of God through the assistance of Gods grace in Christ,we may doe good workes, and by them (accepted through Christ's merits) become more and more iust,in the sight of God.cap.10.where in cheefly,consists the Roman doctrine,of Iustification by good workes.

This doctrine supposed, we will now take a vew, of those texts, which Protestants vsually presse, out of *Scripture mistaken* against it, hauing first proued the Roman doctrine.

The Catholicke Position.

Faith only iustifyeth not.

YOu see that a man is iustifyed by workes, and not by faith only. which must needs be vnderstood of a true and internall iustification before Allmighty God: for it must be that iustification which comes by faith; but that is true and internall iustification, as appeares by all the texts cited hereafter in the paper, for proofe of iustification by faith *only*: that the iustification which S. Iames speakes of here, is the very same with that which comes by faith, is most cleare out of the words themselues. *Yee see that a man is iustifyed by workes, and* Iames 2. v.24.

not

not by faith only. For it would be quite contrary to common ſenſe to vnderſtand a iuſtification before men, in the firſt part of this ſentence, *yee ſee that a man is iuſtifyed by workes*, and a true internall iuſtification in the ſight of God, in the latter part, *and not by faith only*. For the word *only*, clearly demonſtrates, that the ſame iuſtification is to be vnderſtood in both parts of the ſentence. Now that the iuſtification common to both members of this place, muſt neceſſarily be meant of a true iuſtification only in the ſight of God, is out of all queſtion to ſuch as ponder what is deliuered in it: for it would be moſt falſe, were it vnderſtood of a iuſtification only before men: no leſſe then this manner of ſpeech, *yee ſee that this man is vnderſtood by his words, and not by his thoughts only*, would be wholly falſe, were there only mention made of a man's being vnderſtood amongſt men: for amongſt them he is not vnderſtood at all by his thoughts; and ſo the latter part of this propoſition would not be true and therefore to verify this manner of ſpeech, it muſt of neceſſity be meant of a man's being vnderſtood by Allmighty God who only by his own power vnderſtands both thoughts and words; and ſo it is truly ſayd, *yee ſee that a man is vnderſtood* (to wit, by Allmighty God) *by his words, and not by his thoughts only*. And for the very ſame reaſon, this propoſition

ſition of S. Iames *wee ſee that a man is iuſtifyed by workes, and not by faith only*, cannot be vnderſtood of a iuſtification before men: for we are no more iuſtifyed *by faith* before men, then we are vnderſtood amongſt them *by our thoughts:* and therefore it muſt be interpreted of a iuſtification before Allmighty God, who only vnderſtauds our faith as he does our thoughts (by his own power and knowledge) and can only ſee whether our faith be true, ſincere, and iuſtifying, or no; faith being nothing elſe but a thought, aſſent or iudgement of the ſoul. And as all Proteſtants, in the enſuing texts vrged for *iuſtification by faith only*, vnderſtand an internall iuſtification in the ſight of God, ſo muſt they (will they not be vnreaſonably and willfully partiall) vnderſtand the ſame by iuſtification by faith, in this place of S. Iames, which is cleared v. 2. *was not Abraham our father iuſtifyed by worket when he had offered Iſaac his ſone vppon the altar?* for this hauing beene done priuatly in the deſert could not, when it was done, iuſtifie him before men. and yet more clere v. 22. *ſeeſt thou not how faith wrought with his workes, and by workes was faith made perfect?* what is here ſpoken of but the operation of faith and workes in the ſoule, iuſtifying in God's ſight? For faith cannot be truly made perfect but declared to be perfect, by workes ſoe farre as they iuſtifie only

before men. And it is further demonſtrated v.23. *And the Scripture was fulfilled which ſayth;* Rom.4. v.1.2.3. *Abraham beleeued God, and it was imputed vnto him for righteouſneſſe, and he was called the friend of God.* Can any Proteſtant deny this to be meant of an imputation of righteouſneſſe, as they terme it, or a iuſtification before Allmighty God, ſeeing it is the very ſame iuſtification which is mentioned by S. Paul to the Romanes which they mainly contend to be a true iuſtification in the ſight of God: or if they will haue it here a iuſtification only before men, they muſt acknowledge that the ſame mentioned to the Romanes is no other then before men; and ſo, by endeauoring by ſuch ſhifts to weaken the force of this text againſt themſelues, they take away all force from that of Rom.4. to conclude any thing againſt vs. Beſides, this iuſtification of Abraham here mentioned by S. Iames, can be no other then that which is true and interuall before God: for, as it followes in the text, *he was called a friend of God*; and that truly, for he was indeede, as he was called, a friend of God: and hence it follows ineuitably, that the iuſtification which S. Iames deduces from that of Abraham, *by works*, and *not by faith only*, as appeares by the word *then*, *wee ſee then* &c. is a true intrinſecall iuſtification in the ſight of God; for no other, ſaue that, could be rightly

rightly inferred from the former. And indeed though we had none of the foreſayd euidences, to conuince the true meaning of S. Iames, yet what man of iudgment can imagine that this holy Apoſtle would labour ſo much to proue that Chriſtians are iuſtifyed by their good works before men, when that is a matter too cleare and known, to need proofe, and too light and friuolous to deſerue it? or what conſiderate man can thinke that this Bleſſed Apoſtle or the holy Ghoſt by whoſe inſpiration he writ this, would ſo earneſtly exhort Chriſtians to abound in good works, to the end that they may be iuſtifyed before men? ſeeing corrupt human nature is too too prone to doe good workes for ſuch by endes as theſe, and hath more need of a bridle then a ſpurre in this particular, and rather to be deterred from it, then put vppon it, as our Sauiour did the Stribes and Phariſees, who did their works to be ſeene, and conſequently to be prayſed and iuſtifyed before men. This text therefore hauing been demonſtrated to be meant of iuſtification before Allmighty God *by works*, and *not by faith only*; ſeeing S. Paul inſpired by the ſame holy Spirit, in what is cited out of him in the inſuing text, cannot poſſibly contradict S. Iames here, as he muſt needs be thought to haue done if he ſayd (as Proteſtants would haue it) that we are iuſti-

fyed in the ſight of God *by faith only*, and not by good works, working with faith and perfecting it, informing and viuificating it, as S. Iames deſcribes them here. we will now ſee in what ſenſe S. Paul's words are to be vnderſtood, and reconcile them with this text of S. Iames.

Iames 2. v. 22. 26.

The Proteſtant Poſition.

Iuſtification by faith only.

This is proued by Scripture miſtaken.

Rom. 3. v. 28. *Therefore wee conclude, that a man is iuſtifyed by faith without the works of the law.*

Rom. 5. 1. *Being iuſtifyed by faith, we haue peace with God, through our Lord Ieſus Chriſt.*

Rom. 1. 17 *For therein is the righteouſneſſe of God reuealed, from faith to faith, as it is written, the iuſt ſhall liue by faith.*

Gal. 2. 16. *Knowing this, that a man is not iuſtifyed by the works of the law, but by the faith of Chriſt Ieſus: that we might be iuſtifyed by Ieſus Chriſt, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law ſhall no liuing fleſh be iuſtifeyd.*

The firſt miſtake.

The word only, *is not found in any of theſe texts.*

In all theſe texts is not once the words *faith only*, to be found; which is put in this Proteſtant

teſtant Poſition & was to be proued by them. Neither is it conſequent: *a man is iuſtifyed by faith without the works of the law*; therefore a man is iuſtifyed by *faith only*: no more then this follows, *a man is nouriſhed by bread, without the graſſe of the field; therefore a man is nouriſhed by bread only*. for though the graſſe of the feeld do not nouriſh vs, yet many other things beſides bread de nouriſh vs. in like manner, though the woreks done by force of the grace of God, and not by force of the law, do iuſtify vs, and ſo we are not iuſtifyed by *faith ouly*, nor at all by the *works of the law*; but by faith and good works done by the grace of Ieſus Chriſt, and not by the knowledge of the law.

The Second miſtake.

The workes of the law miſunderſtood.

That S. Paul here vnderſtands only by *works of the law*, ſuch works as are done by force and knowledge of the law, before the faith of Chriſt infuſed into a ſoul, or that it is inlightned and aſſiſted by his grace: and by this law is vnderſtood the law written in the books of Moyſes, both morall in the ten Commandements, and ceremoniall, as circumciſion, and other rites and ceremonyes of the Iewes.

That by works of the law, I ſay, are vnder-

ſtood by S.Paul, only ſuch works as are done by force of knowledge of the law, before the inlightning of the faith, and grace of Chriſt, is euident out of this chapter, Rom. 3. v. 14. *Now we know, that what things ſoeuer the law ſayth, it ſayth to them that are vnder the law; that euery mouth may be ſtopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.* Here he ſpeakes of the law, ſpeaking or teaching what is to be done according to it: and then adds preſently, as a concluſion from that knowledge got by the law, v. 10. *therefore by the deeds of the law no fleſh ſhall be iuſtifyed in his ſight: for by the law is the knowledge of ſin.* The reaſon why the deeds of the law inſtify not, is, becauſe they come from the knowledge of the law, & by the law is the knowledge of ſin. wherunto he oppoſes the righteouſneſſe of God, which is by faith of Ieſus Chriſt vnto all, in the firſt texts following verſes 21. *but now the righteouſnetre of God without the law is manifeſted, being witneſſed by the law and Prophets:* v. 22. *euen the righteouſneſſe of God which is by faith of Ieſus Chriſt vnto all, and vppon all them that beleeue; for there is no difference.* This is the known doctrine of all Roman Catholikes againſt the Pelagians, that no worke can iuſtify which comes only by doctrine and light of the written law; but all iuſtifying works muſt come from the faith and grace of Chriſt ſo that we all confeſſe and conclude

with

with S. Paul, that *a man is iuſtifyed by faith vvithout the vvorkes of the lavv*, that is, wirhout ſuch works as are meerly of and from the law, as are oppoſed here by S. Paul to the grace and faith of Chriſt.

Secondly, by the law in this place is vnderſtood, both the motall law written by Moyſes in the ten Commandements; and the ceremoniall, conteyned in the bookes of Leuiticus, Deuteronomij &c. for the morall law, Proteſtants themſelues, doubt not that the Apoſtle ſpeakes of it, and that the ceremonial is here meant is euident in the two next following Verſes, ſpeaking of Iewes and Circumciſion, v. 24. *Is he God of the Iewes only, and not alſo of the Gentils: yea, of the Gentils alſo.* v. 30. *Seeing it is one God vvhich ſhall iuſtify circumciſion by faith, and vncircumciſion through fayth.* and c. 3. *VVhat aduantage then hath the Ievv, or vvhat profit is there of circumciſion?* and the ſeauen laſt verſes of the ſecond chapter make it yet clearer; ſeeing that the Apoſtle's intent is there to proue, that iuſtification did not only belong to the Iewes, but to the Gentils alſo, and therefore the Iewes: were not to thinke that iuſtification came by the obſeruance of their ceremoniall law which Moyſes had giuen them: and whereby they were chiefly diſtinguiſhed from the Gentiles, who had knowledge of the morall law, and eſteemed themſelues obliged to

obserue it. Which is the presẽt doctrine of Romañe Catholikes.

The Third mistake.

The vvord Iustifie missapplied.

Thirdly, by Iustification here, is vnderstood, only the first Iustificatiõ from sinne to iustice, wherby a beleeuer is made of a child of the deuil, the child of God. this is cleare v.23. *For all haue sinned, and come short of the glory of God,* v.23. *being iustifyed freely by his grace, through the redemption vvhich is in Iesu Christ.* v.25. *VVhom God hath set forth to be a propitiation trough faith in his bloud, to declare his righteousnesse for the remission of sinnes that are past, through the forbearante of God.* And in this all agree that the first iustification of a sinner is a worke of the mercy and grace of God, through the merits of our deareſt Sauiour; and cannot be condignly merited by any works precedent. But the Apostle makes here no mention at all of the second iustification, or increase of that iustice and grace which is giuen vs in the first iustification, and wherof S. Ihon speakes Reu.22.v.11. *Qui iustus est, iustificetur adhuc, he that is righteous, let him be righteous still*, saith your English text, which signifyes only a perseuerance in that righteousnesse or iustice which was first receiued; when it should be, *he that is righteous, let*

Concil. Trid. sess. 6. c. 8.

let him be made righteous ſtill: as the latin hath it, *iuſtificetur adhuc*: and all the other phraſes adioyned, ſhew not only a perſeuerance, but alſo an increaſe, of that wickednesſe, or holyneſſe wherin they were before: or, *let him vvorke righteouſneſſe, or iuſtice ſtill*, as the greeke hath it, wich comes all to the ſame purpoſe. Now the queſtion betweene vs and Proteſtants, is only of the ſecond iuſtification, or increace of iuſtice acquired in the firſt; which we only affirme to be augmented by good works done in and through the grace of Ieſus Chriſt.

The fourth miſtake.

The vvord faith *miſconſtrued.*

Fourthly, by faith is not to be vnderſtood a bare, ſole, act of Chriſtian faith; and much leſſe of particular confidence, and application of Chriſt merits to our ſelues, (whereof the Apoſtle ſpeakes not one word in this place) where on Proteſtants rely ſoe much; but a faith viuificated, informed, and animated with charity, and other Chriſtian vertus ioyned with it. This is cleare chap. 4. v. 1. 2. 3. where the faith of Abraham is brought in by the Apoſtle in proofe of what he had ſayd. Now who can deny but this faith was viuificated with charity? ſeeing S. Iames, c. 2. v. 22.

now cited, affirmes, *that his faith wrought with his works, and by works his faith was made perfect.* And Galat.5.v.6. where the Apoſtle treates of the ſame iuſtification by faith, maketh this matter out of queſtion: *for in Ieſus Chriſt neither circumciſion auayleth any thing, nor incircumciſion; but faith, which worketh by loue, or charity.* This truth is imbraced by all Romane Catholikes, though it be not, as they hold, our formall iuſtification, nor a condigne merit of our firſt iuſtification; but only a congruous, and yet ſure diſpoſition to it, through the mercifull and faithfull promiſe of God, and through the only merits of our Sauiour. By all theſe particulars duly pondered, appeares, that this text of the Apoſtle, Rom.3.v.28. *therefore we conclude that a man is iuſtifyed by faith without the works of the law,* ſayes nothing but what is taught by Romane Catholikes vniuerſally. But if Proteſtants would conclude any thing againſt vs, they muſt produce a text which ſayes, *good workes of ſuch as are iuſtifyed already, done by vertue of the grace of Chriſt, and not by the bare knowledge of the law, do not iuſtify,* (and this only is in queſtion betwixt vs) *that is, augment and increaſe that righteouſneſſe or iuſtice already acquired, and make vs more iuſt.* The former anſwer is likewiſe to be applyed to the other texts, Rom.5.v.1. Rom.1.v.17. Galat.2.v.17. for the Apoſtles meaning is the ſame in them all.

Yet

Yet becauſe I intend to giue full ſatisfaction to each text obiected againſt vs, I will adde a word or two to theſe ſeuerall texts.

The ſecond text.

Rom. 5. v. 1. *Being iuſtified by faith, vve haue peace vvith God, through out Lord Ieſus Chriſt.*

This text is miſtaken.

Here S. Paul ſpeakes of the firſt iuſtification, wherby a ſinner is made a ſeruant and friend of God (agreably to Romane Catholiks now deliuered) as appeares, v. 8. *But God commendeth his loue to vs in that vvhile vve vvere yet ſinners, Chriſt dyed for vs, and* v. 10. *for if vvhile vve vvere enemyes, vve vvere reconciled to God, by the death of Chriſt, much more being reconciled, vve ſhall be ſaued by his life:* and the whole ſequell of the chapter ſhewes euidently that his maine diſcourſe is of the firſt iuſtification and attonement of ſinners and enemyes to God through the death of Chriſt: yea euen the text it ſelfe v. 1. here obiected, declares it ſelfe ſufficiently to be meant of the firſt iuſtification, *Therefore being iuſtifyed by faith, vve haue peace vvith God through our Lord Ieſus Chriſt*, ſayth the text; for this hauing *peace vvith God by iuſtification*, argues that before that iuſtification, we had not *peace*, but *enmity* with God,

and

and ſo were in ſtate of ſinne and damnation; which is only true of the firſt iuſtification; for before the ſecond iuſtification or increace of iuſtice we haue that peace with God, and ſo receiue not peace by reaſon of it. And though there were no other anſwer ſaue this, that, of whatſoeuer inſtification this text ſpeakes, Rom.5.v.1. yet *inſtification by faith only*, (for proofe of which it is alleadged, will neuer be proued from it; for it ſayth, being *iuſtifyed by feith*, but no newes here of *faith only*.

The third text.

Rom.1.v.17. *For therin is the righteouſneſſe of God reuealed from faith to faith, as it is vvritten, the iuſt liueth by faith.*

This text is miſtaken.

Theſe words prooue nothing at all for *iuſtification by faith only*, no more then this propoſition, *the iuſt man liues by breath*, proues that the *iuſt man liues by breath only*: for as his liuing corporally *by breath*. hinders not his liuing *by meat, and drinke*, ſo his liuing ſpiritually by faith hinders not his liuing *by good vvorks*: for as *breath, meate, and drinke* concurre to his temporall; ſo faith an good works concurre to his ſpirituall life. and euen Proteſtants themſelues muſt confeſſe that this text, *the iuſt man liueth*

liueth by faith, cannot poſſibly inferre that *he liueth by faith only*: for S. Paul ſaith, Rom. 3. 24. being *iuſtifyed freely by his grace*: and v. 18. *euen ſo by the righteouſneſſe of one, the free gift came vppon all men to the iuſtification of life.* So that according to S. Paul, the iuſt liues by grace, and by the *righteouſnſſe of Chriſt*, as well as by faith; and ſo not by *faith only*. Neyther can it bee anſweared, that faith it ſelf is that grace where of the Apoſtle ſpeakes, and conſequently this obiection of myne is to noe purpoſe, for though faith be a gift and grace of God, yet there are many more gifts and graces beſides it, ſignified by the word grace, and particularly that preuentinge grace, or diuine light, and inſpiration, which the holy Ghoſt infuſes into mans hart as the principles, and cauſes of diuine faith in vs, which is beſtowed vppon vs, purely gratis, and out of mere mercy.

The 4. text, Gal. 2. v. 11. *Knowing that a man is not iuſtifyed by the vvorks of the law, but by the faith of Ieſus Chriſt, that vvee might be iuſtifyed by the faith of Chriſt, and not by the vvorkes of the law: for by the vvorks of the law ſhall no fleſh be iuſtifyed.*

This text is miſtaken.

Theſe words prooue as little as any of the former, that is, nothing at all for iuſtification by *faith only*. For, as it is moſt

manifeſt by the whol precedent context in the chapter, the whol matter there handled, is about Circumciſion and obſeruation of the ceremoniall law of the Iewes, as different from the life and practice of the Gentills: ſee v.2.3.5.7.8.12.14. and chap.4.v.10. *Yee obſerue dayes, and monthes, and tymes, and yeares*, ſaith S. Paul reprehending the Chriſtians for returning to thoſe empty elements of the ceremoniall law, v.6. and the like chap.5.v.1.2.3. about circumciſion, *ſtand, and be not held in againe vvith the yoke of ſeruitude, behold I Paul tell you, that if yee be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing; and I teſtify again to euery man circumciſing himſelfe, that he is a debtour to the whol law.*

Now neither Romane Catholike, nor Engliſh Proteſtant beleeue that they are iuſtifyed by the ceremoniall law of the Iewes, which only is touched in this chapter. And it is no leſſe cleare that there mention is made of the firſt iuſtification wherby a ſinner becoms a child of God, v.10. *VVe ſinners by nature Iewes, and not of the Gentiles.* Nay the text it ſelfe obiected, Gal.2.v.16. ſpeakes clearly of the firſt iuſtification of a ſinner to the ſtate of grace, for by the workes of the law ſhall *no fleſh* be iuſtified; the word *fleſh* ſignifijng moſt familiarly in S. Pauls Epiſtles, that which is not yet *ſpirituall*, but *carnall*, vnder the guilt of ſin, and corruption of nature. For though

ſuch

ſuch as are already iuſtified, retayne the concupiſcenſes of the fleſh in them, yet becauſe they reſiſt and ſubdue them, ſo long as they remaine iuſtified. they are not called *fleſh*, by S. Paul, but rather ſpirituall men.

And that he ſpeakes of the law as known by its own force, light, and doctrine is euident alſo v.16. *For if by the law be righteouſneſſe, then Chriſt is dead in vayne.* which is moſt true if we ſpeake of the law as known to vs, and working in vs by its owne force, wholy independent of the grace and illumination of Chriſt; but can haue no true ſenſe if we ſpeake of the law as iuſtifying by the grace of Chriſt: for then Chriſt will not haue dyed in vaine; becauſe by his death he merited that grace and light by vertu of which only the law iuſtifyes. And chapter 3.v.2. *Haue yee receaued the Spirit by the vvorks of the law, or by the hearing of faith?* wherby is manifeſt, both that he ſpeakes of the workes of the law, as working before the receiuing the holy Ghoſt, and of the firſt inſtification, or receiuing of the Spirit, by the faith of Chriſt. and v.18. *For if a lavv vvere giuen vvich could viuificate, righteouſneſſe vvere truly ffom the lavv.* which ſhewes euidently, that the Apoſtle ſpeakes of the law as conſidered in it ſelfe, and its proper force: for if we conſider it as illuminated by faith, and the grace of Chriſt, it is able to viuificate, and

conſe-

consequently to iustify, as the Apostle here plainly affirmes. And that he speakes of the law as preceding the faith of Christ, is out of all question v.23. *Before faith came, we were concluded vnder the law, into that faith which was to be reuealed. Therefore the law was our schoolmaster in Christ, that we might be iustifyed from faith.*



THE FOVRTH CONTROVERSIE

Of the merit of Good workes.

The Doctrine of the Roman Church deliuered by the Council of Trent in this Point. Seſſione 6.

THe Counell of Trent hauing deliuered (as appeares in the former Controuerſie) that noe worke truly pleaſing to God (which only we vnderſtand by good workes eſteemed by vs meritorious) can poſſibly be done eyther by the force of nature, or of the law, without the inſpiration of the holy Ghoſt; nor that any good motion of the will, aſſiſted, by ſuch Inſpirations, can merit the grace of our firſt Iuſtification, the Council ſuppoſes that none can produce any good worke truly meritorious of heauenly bleſſings, but ſuch as are allready iuſtified, and in ſtate of grace: and ſoe deliuers the inſuing doctrine. Seſſione 6. c. 16.

Bene operantibus vſque in finem, & in Deo ſperantibus, proponenda eſt vita æterna, &

tanquam gratia filiis per Chriſtum Ieſum miſericorditer promiſſa, & tanquam merces ex ipſius Dei promiſſione, bonis ipſorum operibus ac meritis fideliter reddenda.

Eternall life is to be propounded to thoſe who doe well, and hope in God, both as a grace mercifully promiſed through IESVS Chriſt to childeren, and as a reward faithfully to be rendered through the promeſſe of God, to theyr good workes and merits.

And yet the Councill giues an other ground of Chriſtian merits. Ibidem c. 26.

Si quis dixerit, iuſtos non debere pro bonis operibus, quæ in Deo fuerint facta, expectare & ſperare æternam retributionem à Deo per eius miſericordiam, & IESV Chriſti meritum ſi bene agendo, & diuina mandata cuſtodiendo, vſque in finem perſeuerauerint; anathema ſit.

If any one ſhall ſay, that iuſt men are not to expect and hope for an eternall recompence for theyr good workes, which were done in God, through the mercy of God, and the merits of Chriſt, if they perſeuer, to the ende in doing well, and keeping Gods, commandements; let him be accurſed.

And the full reaſon of this doctrine is giuen, Seſſ. 6. c. 16.

Cùm enim ille ipſe Chriſtus IESVS tanquam caput in membra, & tanquam vitis in palmi-

tes, in ipsos iustificatos iugiter virtutem influat; quæ virtus bona eorum opera semper antecedit, & comitatur, & subsequitur; & sine quâ nullo pacto Deo grata, & meritoria esse possunt: nihil ipsis iustificatis amplius deesse credendum est, quo minus plenè illis operibus, quæ in Deo sunt facta, diuinæ legi pro huius vitæ statu satisfeciſſe, & vitam æternam suo etiam tempore, si tamen in gratiâ discesserint, consequendam, verè promeruisse censeantur.

For seeing Christ himselfe, infuses vertu continually into persones allready iustified, as the head into the parts, and the vine into the branches, wich vertu always precedes and accompanies, and follows theyr good workes, and without which they could not by any meanes be gratefull to God, and meritorious; it is to be beleeued that nothing else is wanting to them, but that by those workes, which are done in God, they may be thought to haue satisfied the diuine law, proportionably to the condition of this present life, and truly to haue merited eternall life, which is here after to be rendered to them, if not withstanding they dy in the state of grace.

And to shew, that this doctrine, hinders not the humility of a Christian, the Council, giues this admonition:

Absit tamen vt Christianus homo in seipso vel confidat, vel glorietur, & non in Domino:

cuius tanta eſt erga homines bonitas, vt eorum velit eſſe merita, quæ ſunt ipſius dona.

Farre be it notwithſtanding that a Chriſtian ſhould eyther confide, or glory in himſelfe, and not in our Lord: whoſe goodneſſe to men is ſoe greate, that he wills that thoſe which are his gifts, ſhould be our merits.

And laſtly to ſhew what it is, which iuſt men merit by theyr good workes, the Council deliuers this doctrine. can. 32.

Si quis dixerit — ipſum iuſtificatum bonis operibus, quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam, & Iesv Chriſti meritum, cuius viuum membrum eſt, fiunt, non verè mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, & ipſius vitæ æternæ, ſi tamen in gratiâ diſceſſerit, conſecutionem, & gloriæ augmentum; anathema ſit.

If any one ſhall ſay — that a iuſt perſone, merits not truly by his good workes, which are done by the grace of God and merit of Chriſt, in creace of grace, eternall life; and the attayning eternall life, if he depart hence in ſtate of grace, aud the increace of gloey; let him be accurſed.

From theſe definitions of the Council, is cleare, 1. that none ſaue perſons allready iuſtified can haue theſe meritorious workes. 2. That they muſt all be done by force and vertu of the grace of Chriſt. 3. To make euen ſuch workes which proceed from grace compleatly,

pleatly, and truly meritorious is reqnired the free and mercifull promeſſe of God, wheron all merit is grounded. 4. That this Promeſſe of God, to reward ſuch workes, and the acceptation of thoſe workes to be merits, are grounded in the ſole merits of Chriſt moſt ſacred paſſion. 5. That the things which are merited through ſuch promiſes, and merits of Chriſt, are increace of internall grace, eternall life, the obteyning of eternall life, and the increaſe of glory in heauen, amongſt which ſeeing the Councel puts not actuall grace, that is the inlightning of our vnderſtanding by heauenly thoughts, and the inflaming of our will by pious affections, it giues free liberty for all Chriſtians to beleeue, that noe iuſt perſone, can by his good workes or merits, deſerue to haue ſuch actuall graces, but that they all proceed from the free grace, and mercy of God, beſtowed liberally vppon euery juſt perſone, for the ſole merits of Chriſt, and not dew to any whatſoeuer of his good workes. 6. Hence the Council affirmes that all our merits are the true gifts of God, coming from his free grace, and that ſoe we are neyther to confide, nor glory in our ſelues, but only in God. 7. Hence clearly follows, that this doctrine of merits, cannot poſſibly be any way injurious to our Sauiours paſſion, ſeeing it is grounded, both according to the grace where by ſuch

meritorious workes are produced, and the free promeſſe of God to accept of them, as meritorious, and to render a reward to them, for the ſole paſſion of our deareſt Sauiour, the vertu whereof is applied to vs by the meritorious force of ſuch workes, as it alſo is by the impetratory force of prayres, the firſt derogating noe more from the power of his merits, then the ſecond of his praires.

That which is here ſayd, of the impretatory, and meritorious, is to be extended to the ſatisfactory vertu of good workes. For ſo the Council of Trent, ſpeakes of them. Seſſione 14. cap. 8. neque verò ita noſtra eſt ſatisfactio hæc, quam pro peccatis noſtris exoluimus, vt non ſit per Chriſtum IESVM: nam qui ex nobis tanquam ex nobis nihil poſſumus; eo cooperante qui nos confortat omnia poſſumus, ita vt non habeat homo vnde glorietur, ſed omnis gloriatio noſtra in Chriſto eſt, in quo viuimus, in quo meremur, in quo ſatisfacimus, facientes fructus dignos pœnitentiæ, qui ex illo vim habent, ab illo offeruntur Patri, & per illum acceptantur à Patre.

Neyther is this ſatisfaction ſoe ours which wee pay for our ſinnes, that it is not through IESVS Chriſt. For wee who of our ſelues, as of our ſelues, can doe nothing, he cooperating who comforts vs we can doe all things, ſoe that man hath nothing where of to glory, but

all

all our glory is in Chriſt, *in vvhom vve liue, in vvhom vve merit, in vvhom vve ſatisfie*, bringing forth worthy fruits of penance, *vvhich haue force from him, are offered by him to the father, and are accepted by the Father through him.*

To theſe Athorities of the Council of Trent in declaration of the Romane doctrine, I thought fit to adde one clauſe of the 39 articles, which fauours much the merit of Good workes.

Arti. 12. *Of Good vvorkes,*

Al be it that good workes, which are the fruits of faith, cannot put away ſins, and indure the ſeuerity of Gods iudgement, *yet are they pleaſing and acceptable to God in Chriſt.*

If pleaſing and acceptable to God in Chriſt, then noe way ſinfull, but truly and abſolutly good and iuſt, for noe ſin, whether out of Chriſt or in Chriſt can be pleaſing, and acceptable to God, for then God ſhould not be a hater, but a louer of ſin, and Chriſt ſhould not take away ſinnes, but make them pleaſing, and acceptable to God, which is a flat blaſphemy. If truly and abſolutely without ſin, and iuſt, then hauing in holy Scripture the promiſes of God annext to them, to reward them, and that *we muſt receiue Gods promiſes in ſuch vviſe, as they be generally ſet forth to vs in holy Scripture*, as ſaith article 17. ſub finem, it is

most manifest, that all the good workes of iust and righteous persones, shall be rewarded in Christ, and soe be truly meritorious in Christ: hauing such a supernaturall goodnesse. cõformable to that heauenly reward in them. which is all that is taught, in this point, by the Church of Rome.

The Protestant Position.

That the good workes of the Regenerate are not such, as can deserue heauen.

This is prouued by Scripture mistaken.

The first Proofe.

Rom. 8. v. 18. *For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shal be reuealed vnto vs.*

The first mistake.

Nothing against merits in this text.

NO more is a graine of mustard seed worthy to be compared to that high and spread stalke, & those multitudes of increase which it beares; and yet it produces them: as also do the small sufferings of this world

world that fayre tree of life, and glory in heauen, as witneſſeth S. Paul 2. Cor. 4. v. 17. *For our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for vs a farre more exceeding, and eternall weight of glory.*

The ſecond Proof.

So likewiſe yee, when you haue done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay; we are vnprofitable ſeruants: we haue done that which was but our duty to doe. Luke 17. v. 10.

The Second miſtake.

Theſe words miſſapplied *againſt merits.*

What is there here which denyes the deſeruing heauen by the good works of the regenerate? is it becauſe we haue only done our duty? and why then deſerues a ſeruant his wages, by doing his duty, and nothing elſe? is it becauſe we are vnprofitable ſeruants? and who can bring any profit to God who is vncapable of profit? Hence is only proued that Allmighty God is no way beholden to vs, but we to him for all our good works: and therefore we are all to humble our ſelues before him; and to acknowledge that all our merits are his gifts, and the reward beſtowed on them, grounded in his free promeſſe, and acceptation of them, for the merits of Chriſt.

The third Proof.

Eph. 2: 8. 9. 2: 21. *VVe are not ſaued by workes, leaſt any one ſhould boaſt. if righteouſneſſe come by the law, then Chriſt is dead in vaine.*

The Third miſtake.

The word workes *miſunderſtood.*

The anſwer to Rom. 3. v. 28. &c. is here to be applyed: for he ſpeaketh manifeſtly of the works of ſinners before their firſt iuſtification, as appeares v. 11. 12. 13. 14. and of works done by force of the law only; which he diſtinguiſheth from the good works of the regenerate, v. 10. *For we are his workemanſhip, created in Chriſt Ieſus vnto good workes, which God hath before ordayned that we ſhould walke in them.*

The fourth Proofe.

Rom. 6. v. 23. *For the wages of ſinne is death: but the gift of God is eternall life through Ieſus Chriſt our Lord.* if a full gift, then no merit.

The fourth miſtake.

The word wages, *and* gift *miſſapplied.*

The true mearing of this text muſt be drawn from the greeke word here vſed, where

where that which the Engliſh hath *wages*, is in greeke ὀψώνια, *opſonia*, which properly ſignifies the baſe and ignoble ſtipend which was wont to be giuen to common ſouldiers, as their ordinary pay: and therefore it is fitly. Vſed to expreſſe the wages of ſinne, which is death. That which in Engliſh here is called *a gift*, is in greeke χάρισμα, *chariſma*, which ſignifyes a donatiue, or noble an pretious reward; which was vſed anciẽtly to be beſtowed vppon ſuch as had caried themſelues famouſly and valiently (where by they deſerued it) for ſome ſeruice of war, aboue their ordinary pay: and therefore was fit to be applyed to ſignify that high reward which ſhal be obtayned in heauen by ſuch as ſhall haue perſeuered in good workes till death.

Which could not bee ſignifyed by the other word ὀψώνια, by reaſon of the baſeneſſe and lowneſſe of it: ſo that both theſe words doe properly ſignify a recompenſe: the one a high and noble one, and yet proceeding from the worthy and liberall diſpoſition of the Prince, and ſo happily exceeding the preciſe worth of the ſeruice, as alſoe Allmighty God doth in rewarding our works, *qui remunerat vltra condignum*, who rewards beyond the condignity and worth of the merit, as our Diuines teach; and the other an ordinary low

ſtipend

ſtipend due to common ſouldiers who haue noe particular worth in them. Soe that the true meaning of this text, according to the proper ſignification of the words in the original is this the baſe recompence and hirelings wages of ſiñ is death, but the high, noble and rich reward of God is eternall life, and thus the text makes nothing againſt the merit of good workes, but rather, makes playnly for them. Further if wee take the word χάρισμα for a pure free gift wee may anſwer with S. Auſtin, and the Couucil of Trent now cited that becauſe the good works & merits themſelues are the free gifts of God, ſo alſo the glory of heauen which is deſerued by them, is called truly a gift; as if one ſhould giue any one a tree the fruit which it beare alſo may be called his gift who gaue the tree. More ouer, ſeing (as we haue learned from the Council of Trent abque cited) that the primary title, and right which all Gods childeren haue to eternall life, is that of inheritaene; which is a free gift of God, before all merit of heauen, eternal life may be properly called the gift of God, as being abſolutly decreed to be beſtowed vppon them as his childeren, before they had any merits, to deſerue it, ſuppoſing that they dy in ſtate of grace.

The

The Catholicke Position.

That the works of the regenerate are such as can deserue heauen.

I haue fought a good fight, I haue finished my course, I haue kept the faith. Hence forth there is layd vp for me a crowne of righteousnesse (*iustitiæ*, of *iustice*, sayth the Greeke and Latin) *vvhich the Lord the righteous* (*iustus*, the iust) *iudge shall giue me* ~~δώσει~~ *ἀποδώσει*, teddet, shall restore vnto me, *at the last day*, (the greeke at that day) *and not to me only, but vnto them also vvho loue his coming.* By *a crovvn of iustice*, he meanes a true reward, or prize, got by labour, as appeares, *knovv ye not that those vvhich runne in a race, runne all, but one receiueth the prize, so run, that yee may obteyne and euery man that striueth for the mastery, is temperate in all things: novv they doe it to obtaine a corruptible crown, but vve an incorruptible: for our light affliction vvhich is but for a moment, vvorketh for vs a farre more exceeding and eternall vveight of glory.* 2.Tim.4. v.7.8. 1.Cor.9. v.24.25. 2.Cor.4. v.17.

If our afflictions worke a crowne of eternall glory then they are a true cause of it which cannot be but by merit. Gal.6.v.8. *For vvhat things a man shall sovv, those also shall hee reape for hee that sovveth to his flesh* (latin in his flesh) *from his flesh also shall reape corruption: but hee that soweth in the spirit shall reape life euerlasting.* So that

that life euerlaſting is a proper fruit of a ſpirituall and godly life, and ſo ſuch a life, is the true cauſe of ſaluation. Reuel.3.v.4.Speaking of the elect.ſaith: *They ſhall vvalke vvith me in vvhyte garments, becauſe they are worthy.* Therefore the true ſeruants of God, haue ſomething in this world which makes them worthy of eternall life: and that is theyr innocent and vnſpotted liues, as the Euangeliſt declares in the next precedent words, *but thou haſt ſome in Sardis who haue not defiled their garment.* R.3.v.8. Behold *I haue giuen thee a dore open which noman can ſhut, becauſe thou haſt ſome ſmal vertue, and haſt kept my word, and haſt not denyed my name.* where the vertuous life, and good works of that perſon, are affirmed to be the cauſe, why eternall happineſſe was to be beſtowed vppon him. Hebr.6.9.for God is not vnrighteous, to forget your worke, and labour ofloue, which yee haue ſhewed towards his name, in that yee haue miniſtred to the Saints and doe miniſter, and v.12. That yee be not ſlothfull but followers of them, who through faith, and patience inherit the promiſſes. where it is ſaid, both that it belongs to the iuſtice of God to remember our good workes, and that not only by faith, but by patience allſo (and the ſame is of all other vertues) wee inherit the promiſes, as Abraham did, v.13.14. Reuel.3. v.10. *Becauſe thou haſt kept the word of my patience,*

tience, I will preſerue the from the hower of temptation which is to come through the whole world to tempt the inhabitants vppon earth. where the deſert of good workes is moſt clearly deliuered.

The Proteſtant argnment againſt merit of Good workes.

The bleſſed ſaints were euer ready to acknowledge theyr *vnworthyneſſe* with humility.

Miſtake.

This tutches not the merit of good workes.

THey are humble and euer will be, and muſt be according to our doctrine both becauſe they are neuer fully certain, that they haue any one worke that is truly pleaſing to God, and if they were fully certain, they muſt attribute all the glory to him, ſeeing it is only his grace which workes all good in them. And all theyr merits, are his gifts, as S. Anguſtin ſays, and rewarded through the free acceptation of them for the merits of Chriſt according to the Concill of Trent ſeſſ. 25. c. 16. But if by this title be vnderſtood, that noe iuſt man hath any workes truly good, and pleaſing to God, through the working of Gods grace in them (as the miſtaken proofes ſeeme to inſinuate) it will be a falſe humility, becauſe it

ſtands

ſtands vppon a falſe ground, and ſoe no humility of Saints.

This Proteſtant argument is proued by Scripture miſtaken.

The firſt proofe.

Dan. 9. 7. *O Lord righteouſneſſe belongs vnto thee, and vnto vs confuſion of face:* ſaith Daniel.

The firſt miſtake.

The Perſons here mentioned vvere not Saints.

Theſe words were ſpoken by great ſinners. Therefore Daniel aſcribes confuſion of face to the Izraelites of his tyme, becauſe from the higheſt to the loweſt they, and theyr Predeceſſours had greeuouſly ſinned againſt the law of God. As appeares through the whole prayer of Daniel in that chapter, and he puts his own ſinnes to the reſt, v. 20. as hauing tranſgreſſed with the reſt. But how proues this that neyther he not any other Saint had done any good workes?

The ſecond proofe.

Pſal. 103. 3. *And Dauid. If thou Lord ſhouldeſt be extreame to marke vvhat is done amiſſe. O Lord vvho may abide it.*

The

The ſecond miſtake

This text proues that all Saints haue ſome ſinnes, but not that they haue no merits.

How proues this that noe Saint can haue any good wotkes, or merits, for they doe many things a miſſe, yet through the grace of Chriſt they may doe ſome things aright?

The third proofe.

Speake not thou in thy hart ſaing for my righteouſneſſe, the Lord hath brought me in to poſſeſſe the Land, but for the wickedneſſe of this nation, the Lord doth driue them out from before thee, was the counſell of Moyſes to the Iſraelites. Deut. 9. v. 2.

The third miſtake.

This tutches ſinners but not Saints.

The reaſon of this counſel was becauſe the Iſraelites had greeuouſly offended god in the wilderneſſe as appeares, v. 7. 8. 9. &c.

where Moyſes reekons vp the haynous Idolatrie, and other great ſinnes which they committed.



THE

THE FIFT CONTROVERSIE Of Purgatory.

The Romane Doctrine declared in the Council of Trent.

Sess. 6. Can. 30.

SI quis post acceptam iustificationis gratiam cuilibet peccatori pœnitenti ita culpam remitti, & reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri dixerit, vt nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exoluendæ vel in hoc sæculo, vel in futuro in Purgatorio, antequam ad Regna cælorum aditus patere possit; anathema sit.

If any one shall say, that after the grace of iustification is receiued, the fault, and guilt of eternall punishment is soe remitted to euery penitent person, that there remaines noe guilt, or liableness to some temporall punishment to be payed eyther in this world, or in the world to come in Purgatory, before the enterance into the Kingdome of heauen can be opened to them; let him be accursed.

Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 25. Decreto de Purgatorio

Præcipit ſancta Synodus, vt ſanam de Purgatorio doctrinam, à ſanctis Patribus, & ſacris Coneiliis traditam, à Chriſti fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, & vbique prædicari diligenter ſtudeant. Apud rudem verò plebem difficiliores, ac ſubtiliores quæſtiones, quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt, & ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis acceſſio, à popularibus concionibus ſecludantur. Incerta item vel quæ ſpecie falſi laborant, euulgari, ac tractari non permittant. Ea verò quæ ad curioſitatem quandam, aut ſuperſtitionem ſpectant, vel turpe lucrum ſapiunt, tanquam ſcandala, & fidelium offendicula prohibeant.

The holy Synode commands the Biſhops that they take diligent care, that the ſound doctrine of Purgatory, deliuered by the holy Fathers, and the ſacred Councils be beleeued, held, taught, and preached, by the faithfull of Chriſt. But that amongſt the common ſort of people, all difficult, and ſubtile queſtions, which make not for edification, & by which commonly there is noe acceſſe to piety, be ſecluded from popular ſermons. But thoſe things which tend to curioſity, or which taſt of baſe lucre, as being ſcandalls, and offenſes of the faithfull, they are to prohibite.

In theſe two places we ſee, 1. That none but

but iuſt perſones ſuffer in Purgatory, 2. That thoſe paines are only the remainder of ſuch temporall paines, dew after the remiſſion of ſinne, and eternall puniſhment; which they deſerued in this life. 3. That the Church of Rome, forbids all temporall gaines to be made, of the doctrine of Purgatory, where by it appeares how injurious the aſperſion of ſome of our Aduerſaries is to the Church of Rome. in accuſing her, to haue inuented Purgatory, not to gaine ſoules, but mony. 4. All difficult queſtions, are here excluded from ordinary ſermons, to common people, and all curioſities forbidden.

The Proteſtant Poſition.

That the ſoules of the faithfull (in theyr departure) are happy, wee often read: but noe newes of Purgatory.

This is proued by Scripture miſtaken.

Bleſſed are the dead who dye in the Lord: from hence forth ſaith the ſpirit, that they may reſt from theyr labours, and theyr workes follow them.

The firſt miſtake.

The text ſaith not they reſt preſently *after theyr death.*

They are not ſayd here to reſt preſently after theyr departure, but that they *may reſt*: and yet they may be termed bleſſed, as our Mat. 5. 3. Sauiour calls the pore in ſpirit bleſſed in this world, and in theyr miſery: becauſe the Kingdome of heauen belongs to them, as it does to thoſe in Purgatory.

The ſecond miſtake.

The word labours *miſapplyed.*

They are not ſayd to reſt from all labour; but from *their labours*; that is ſuch labours, perſecutions, afflictions, ſorrowes, temptations, mortifications, troubles, anxietyes as they ſuffered in this world; from all which they reſt after death. By theyr labours alſo may be fitly here vnderſtood theyr good workes, and patience in ſuffering the miſeries of this life with hope of eternall reward, ſo that they are ſayd to reſt from their labours, becauſe the recompence and crown of their former labours are alloted to them as certainly to follow, as the next words declare, *opera enim eorum ſequuntur illos, for their workes*, (that is, their labours)

labours) *follow them*: and yet in some of them it may happen, that they, may not presently receiue the reward of them which hinders not the resting of their labours, because they are not to haue any reward for what they suffer after this life.

The second proofe out of Scripture mistaken.

For wee know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolued, wee haue a building of God, a house not made with hands eternal in heauen. 2. Cor. 5. v. 1.

This text is mistaken.

These words say not that presently after death they shall goe into that heuenly house.

How follows it hence, that so soone as they depart they must goe into this house prepared for them? seeing that many may haue houses that are hindred to liue in them, especially in these distracted tymes: and our Sauiour saith, *Blessed are the pore in spirit: for theirs is the kingdome of heauen*; euen whilst they are liuing in this world. And the Apostle: *Now therefore yee are no more strangers and furainers, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of* Mat. 5. 3. Ephes. 2. v. 19.

1.ep.Io.c. 5.13. God. And yet more clearly S.Iohn, *theſe things I writte vnto you that yee may know, that yee haue life euerlaſting, yee who beleeue in the name of the ſone of God.* That is in full hope and expectation, not in actual poſſeſſion, which yet is ſayd more clerely to belong to thoſe in Purgatory, who haue, an infallible certainty, of life eternall.

The third proofe from Scripture miſtaken.

Wiſd.3. v.1. *But the ſoules of the righteous are in the hands of God, and no torment ſhall touch them.*

Miſtake.

The word *torment* miſvnderſtood.

The Latin hath it, *non tanget illos tormentum mortis: the torment of death, ſhall not touch them.* which is moſt true of all the iuſt departed; becauſe they ſhall liue eternally: but Proteſtants regard not the vnlgar Latin tranſlation. The greeke hath βάσανος, which, according to Scapula, particularly ſignifyes a torment, to which malefactours, or ſuſpected to be ſo, are put to make them confeſſe the truth, or to try whether they be guilty or no, as are the racke, or ſuch like. Now no ſuch torment as this; ſhall tuch the ſoules of the iuſt departed, becauſe God hath ſufficiently tryed them,

and

and approued of them in this life, as apeares v. 5. *and hauing beene a little chaſtiſed, they ſhall be greatly rewarded, for God proued them, and found them vvorthy of him ſelfe.*

Which is a playne place for merits: but when it is againſt Proteſtants it is only apocryphal.

If any ſhall demand, whether the word Purgatory be expreſſed in Scripture, I anſwer that it is as much expreſſed, as the word *trinity*, ὁμόσιον, diuine Perſon, which not withſtanding, are beleeued by Proteſtants.

If it be replied, that at leaſt the ſubſtance or meaning of thoſe words, are expreſſed in Scripture; I anſwer the ſame of *Purgatory*. which I demonſtrate in this maner. Purgatory is nothing elſe according to the Council of Trent now cited, but *a place where temporall puniſhments are ſuffered by iuſt perſones after death, vvich they deſerued in this life.* Now if any iuſtified ſoul be and often is liable after death to ſuffer ſuch puniſhments, then certainly there muſt be ſome certaine place where they muſt be ſuffered. But iuſtified ſoules may be and often are liable to ſuffer ſuch puniſhments after death, ergo there muſt be ſuch a place where in they are to ſuffer them. That iuſtified ſoules may be and often are liable to ſuch puniſhments I proue thus. Iuſtified perſones yet liuing after the remiſſion of theyr ſinues, and

conſequently of eternall torment, are liable to ſome temporall puniſhment, therefore ſouls departed of iuſt perſones, may, and often are liable to the like. I proue the antecedent, out of the , 2. Sam. 12. v. 13. 14. *And Dauid ſaid vnto nathan I haue ſinned againſt the Lord, and Nathan ſaid vnto Dauid, the Lord alſo hath put away thy ſinnes thou ſhalt not dy: Howbeit, becauſe by this deed thou haſt ginen great occaſion to the enewies of the Lord to blaſpheme, the child alſo which is borne vnto the, ſhall ſurely dy.* whete for that very ſinne which was *put away*, and forgiuen, Dauid was puniſhed by the death of his child,

Rom. 6. v. 23. *becauſe thou haſt ginen by this deede*, &c. the child ſhall dy.

The ſame is proued by the example of Adam whoe after his ſinne was forgiuen him, was notwithſtanding liable to the puniſhment of death (which is the wages of ſinne) as are alſo all inſt perſones, for the ſame reaſon.

The antecedent therefore being clere, I proue the conſequence, by this argument.

Reu. 22, 12. 1. Pet. 1. 17. Seeing God is noe reſpecter of perſones, and that he rewards euery one according to theyr workes, whoſouer deſerues the like puniſhmēt that Dauid deſerued, ſhall ſurely be puniſhed, as Dauid wa:slet vs therefore put this caſe, that at the ſame time with Dauid, there had been an other Perſon, guilty of ſinnes as greate as

were

were thoſe of Dauid, who ſhould haue alſo repented, with the ſame degree of ſorrow, and conſequently obteyned pardone of his ſinne as Dauid did, this ſinner muſt haue been liable to the ſame temporall puniſhment that Dauid was, now ſuppoſe that this other ſinner ſhould haue died, the very inſtant after his ſinne was forgiuen him, according to the doctrine of the Romane Church he ſhould haue been puniſhed temporally in the other world, with a puniſhment correſpondent to that of Dauid, and ſoe God ſhould not haue been a reſpecter of perſones, but haue rewarded euery one according to theyr workes, but according to Proteſtants, he ſhould haue had no puniſhment at all after this life, and conſequently, he ſhould not haue been rewarded according to his workes, not ſuffering the condigne puniſhment, which he truly deſerued, and God ſhould haue proceeded vnequally, in inflicting his puniſhments, and haue had reſpect to his perſone more then to that of Dauid. neyther is Purgatory any way injurious to the iuſtice of God, becauſe though he forgiue the guilt of the ſinne, and the eternall puniſhment, for which man is not able to ſatiſtisfie, yet he reteynes a parte of the puniſhment, which being finite and temporall, may eyther by workes of penance and patience be remitted in this world, or payed

in

in ſthe world to come, or releaſed by the prayers,and penances of other faithfull Chriſtians. And this may ſatisfye for the point of Purgatory.



THE

THE SIXT CONTROVERSIE

Of the Reall Preſence of the Body and blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt.

The Doctrine of the Church of Rome, deliuered in the Council of Trent.

Seſſ. 13. Can. 1.



I quis negauerit in Sanctiſſimo Euchariſtiæ Sacramento contineri verè, realiter, & ſubſtantialiter Corpus & Sanguinem, vnâ cum animâ & diuinitate Domini noſtri IESV Chriſti, ac proinde totum Chriſtum, ſed dixerit tantummodo eſſe in eo vt in ſigno, vel figurâ, aut virtute; anathema ſit.

If any oue ſhall denie that in the moſt holy Euchariſt is conteyned truly, really, and ſubſtantially the body, and blood, togeather with the ſoul & diuinity of our Lord IESVS Chriſt, and conſequently whol Chriſt; but ſhall ſay that he is in it, only as in a ſigne, or figure, or vertu; let him be accurſed.

Ibidem.

Ibidem. Can. 2.

Si quis dixerit in Sacroſancto Euchariſtiæ Sacramento remanere ſubſtantiam panis & vini, vnâ cum corpore Domini IESV Chriſti, &c. anathema ſit.

If any one ſhall ſay that in the holy Sacrament of the Eucheriſt remaines the ſubſtance of bread and wine, togeather with the body and blood of our Lord IESVS Chriſt, &c. let him be accurſed.

Ibidem. Can. 4.

Si quis dixerit, peractâ conſecratione in admirabili Euchariſtiæ Sacramento non eſſe corpus & ſanguinem Domini noſtri IESV Chriſti, ſed tantùm in vſu dum ſumitur, non autem ante vel poſt, &c. anathema ſit.

If any one ſhall ſay, that the conſecration being done, in the admirable Sacrament of the Euchariſt is not the body and blood of our Lord IESVS Chriſt, but only in the vſe, whilſt it is receiued, and neyther before nor after, &c. let him be accurſed.

Ibidem. C. 6.

Si quis dixerit, in ſancto Euchariſtiæ Sacramento Chriſtum vnigenitum Dei Filium non eſſe cultu latriæ, etiam externo adorandum, &c. anathema ſit.

If any one ſhall ſay, that Chriſt the only Sone of God in the holy Sacrament of the Eucha-

Euchariſt, is not to be worſhipped with the *worſhip of latria, or diuine worſhip, euen externall*; &c. let him be accurſed.

This is part of the doctrine of the Council of Trent in this point, the reſt may be ſeen in the Council, as drawn from this.

To diſpoſe the Reader to a right conceipt of this high myſtery, and to informe him, vppon what ground the Church of Rome teaches this doctrine, I thought it neceſſary to cite thoſe texts of the new Teſtament, which deliuer the inſtitution of this Sacrament that the Reader may with one vew, ſee how largely, and clearly the holy Scripture, if it be vnderſtood according to the proper ſignification of the words, ſpeakes for this doctrine of the Reall preſence. And that I may not be thought to haue cited the words, otherwiſe then Proteſtants admit of them, I will cite the texts as I finde them in the Proteſtant Engliſh bible.

Mat.26.v.26.27.28.29.

And as they were eating Ieſus tooke bread and bleſſed *it*, and brake *it*, and gaue *it*, to his diſciples and ſaid, take, eate, this is my body.

And he tooke the cup, and gaue thankes, and gaue it to them, ſaying drinke ye all of it;

For this is my blood of the new Teſtament, which is ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſinnes.

S. Marke

S.Marke c.14.v.22.23.24.25.

And as they did eate, Ieſus tooke bread, and bleſſed, and brake *it*, and gaue to them, and ſaid, take eate, *this is my body*.

And he tooke the cup and when he had giuen thankes, he gaue it to them, and they all drank of it, and he ſaid vnto them, this is my blood of the new Teſtament which is ſhed for many.

Luc c.22.v.19.20.

And he tooke bread and gaue thankes, and brake it, and gaue vnto them ſaying, this is my body which is giuen for you, this doe in rememberance of me.

Likewiſe the cup after ſupper ſaying, this cup is the new Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you.

S.Paul 1.Cor.11.v.23.24.25.

For I haue receiued of the Lord that which alſo I deliuer vnto you, that the Lord Ieſus the ſame night in which he was betrayed tooke bread.

And when he had giuen thankes, he brake it and ſaid, take eate this in my body, which is broken for you, doe this in remembrance of me.

After the ſame maner alſo he tooke the cup when he had ſupped, ſaying, this cup is the new Teſtament in my blood, doe this as often as yee drinke in remembrance of me.

The

The Proteſtant diſcourſe of the Euchariſt begins thus.

Obiection 1.

THe inſtitution of this Sacrament is expreſſed in the 3 firſt Euangeliſts S. Mathew, Mark, and Luke, and alſo by S. Paul, in all which they agree in theſe 4 thinges, that IESVS tooke, bleſſed, brake and gaue bread: for he that ſaith, IESVS tooke bread, bleſſed, brake and gaue it, ſaith plainely enough, that he brake, and gaue bread, and not the ſpecies of bread as they hold.

Anſwer.

If this obiection intend to proue (as certainly it doth) thar our Sauiour tooke, bleſſed, brake, aud gaue bread to his diſciples ſo, that that which he gaue them, was bread remaining in the ſame ſubſtance of naturall bread which it had when he tooke it, I deny that our Sauiour gaue bread to his diſciples, or that the three Euangeliſts and S. Paul cited agree in this: the proofe that our Sauiour gaue naturall bread to his diſciples, *becauſe* (ſaith the obiection) *he that ſaith Ieſus tooke, bread, brake, and gaue* it, *ſaith plainly enough that he brake and gaue bread:* is grounded in a falſe tranſlation or addition to the text of holy Scripture in the

Engliſh Proteſtant Bibles: for neither hath the greeke nor latin the word *it*; and though the Proteſtant Bible, of the yeare 1630. and 1632. haue theſe words, *Ieſus tooke bread and bleſſed it, and brake it, and gaue it to his diſciples*, all in the ſame letter and print, as if the word *it* were no leſſe in the originall then the others adioyned, yet the latter Bibles and namely that of the yeare 1646. put the word *it* in a different letter, to ſignify that it is nor in the originall, but added (as they pretend) for greater explication, as appeareth in a thouſand other places: and in the Bibles of the yeares 1630. and 1632. S. Marke and S. Luke haue the words thus, *Ieſus tooke bread, and bleſſed, and brake it, and gaue vnto them*: where the word *it* is not ioyned to *bleſſed* and *gaue*, but only to *brake*, and then the word *it* is put in a different ſmaller letter then the other words. All which conuince that the word *it* is not in the originall; and ſo is not holy diuine Scripture, but an addition of men and ſo no ſolid argument can be drawn from the word *it* as from the word of God, not being the word of God, but of men. And hence alſo appeares, how cunningly the Proteſtant tranſlatours detaine the ignorāt readers by putting in words ſeruing, as they thinke, to their own purpoſe in the very ſame print and letter with the reſt which are ioyned to them, and

are in the originall, as if they were in the Originall no leſſe then the others; which notwithſtanding in othet editions, tranſlations, and places of Scripture they ſignify, not to be in the originall nor Gods word, by printing them in a leſſer letter, after they were conuinced of fraud and falſity in the former. And thus, in ſome editions putting this and ſuch like words in the ſame letter with the reſt, and in others in a different, the vnlearned which are not able to examine, what is, and what is not in the Originall, may be in doubt which of theſe tranſlations is the true word of God, and cannot be infallibly certain of either of them ſeeing the tranſlatours of theyr Church, which are of equall authority, ſome of them put a word in their text in the ſame tenour, as if it were no leſſe Scripture then the reſt; and others in a different letter. to ſignify, that that word is not Scripture, but added by them (as they ſuppoſe) for greater clarity.

If it ſhould be anſwered, that whether the word *it* be in the ſacred text, or no, yet the argument will haue force, for though the text runne thus, *Ieſus tooke bread, and bleſſed, and brake, and gaue to his diſciples*, yet it may ſeeme that he bleſſed, brake, and gaue no other thing then that very bread which he tooke, remayning in its own ſubſtance and nature. For certainly

he muſt haue bleſſed, and broken, and giuen ſomthing to his diſciples: and what can that be imagined to be but what he tooke? that therefore which he tooke, hauing beene true naturall bread, as the text expreſſly ſayth, *Ieſus tooke bread*, he muſt be ſuppoſed to haue *bleſſed*, and *broken*, and *giuen* true naturall bread to his diſciples.

I anſwer, that our Sauiour, though he be ſuppoſed to haue bleſſed, broken, and giuen ſome thing to his diſciples, yet it follows not that he broke and gaue naturall bread: for he might take bread remaining in its own nature, and after breake and giue his Body, wherinto the bread which he tooke, was changed: as in the marriage feaſt of Galilé after the veſſells were filled with water, and our Sauiour ſayd, *draw now and beare to the gouernour of the feaſt*: certainly they drew, and caryed, and the gouernour of the feaſt drunk ſomthing; yet it followes not, that as they filled the veſſells with water, ſo they drew, and carryed, and the gouernour of the feaſt drunk naturall water; but as it is ſayd v. 9. *water made wine*, or wine wherinto the naturall water wherwith the ſeruāts filled the veſſells, was changed. yea though the word *it* had beene in the text, or were ſuppoſed to be rightly ioyned to it, could any one thence proue more, that, as our Sauiour tooke naturall

turall bread, ſo he brake and gaue naturall bread remayning the very ſame which he tooke, then one can proue from the water of Galilé that as the ſeruants filled the veſſells with naturall water, ſo they drew, and caryed, and the maiſter of the feaſt drunk naturall water remayning the very ſame which was filled, becauſe the text ſayes v.8. *and they caryed* it, and v.9. *the ruler of the feaſt knew not whence it was.*

But the objection in preuention of this auſwer vrgeth the former argument yet further in this manner.

Obiection 2.

For the actions of *brake* and *gaue*, were before the words of conſecration *This is my Body*; and conſequently, not being changed, it muſt be bread which he brake and gaue.

Anſwer.

This argument proceeds from miſunderſtanding and miſtaking this text of Scripture. for though it ſaith, our Sauiour brake, and gaue to his diſciples, and ſayd, *This is my Body*; yet it ſayes not (as the objection would haue it ſay) that our Sauiour after he brake and gaue to his diſciples, ſayd, *This is my Body*, theſe being very different ſenſes: for though the Scripture firſt mentioneth *brake* and *gaue*, and

then ſets downe that our Sauiour ſayd *This is my Body*, yet it may well ſtand with the truth of the words, that at the ſame tyme and inſtant whilſt he brake and gaue, he ſayd, *This is my Body*, and ſo gaue not bread till it was changed into his Body, as if one ſhould giue a peece of bread to a perſon in want, one might ſay truly, *he tooke bread and brake it, and gaue it to him, and ſayd, take this almes*; though he ſpake theſe words, *take this almes*, at the very ſame tyme when he gaue it. And that our Sauiour ſpake theſe words, *This is my Body*, whilſt he was giuing what he gaue to his diſciples. and not after, is manifeſt: firſt, becauſe S. Luke affirmes it to be ſo, *he tooke bread, and brake, and gaue to them, ſaying, This is my Body*: that is, whilſt he gaue, he was pronouncing theſe words. and though in the inſtitution of the chalice, S. Marke ſayes, *and he tooke the cup, and when he had giuen thankes, he gaue to them*, &c. *and ſayd, This is my Bloud of the new Teſtament, which ſhall be ſhed for many*. Yet S. Luke ſaies: *Likewiſe the cup alſo after ſupper, ſaying, This cup is the new Teſtament in my Bloud, which ſhall be ſhed for you*. S. Paul alſo in the ſame manner. *alſo he tooke the cup when he had ſupped, ſaying, This cup is the new Teſtament in my Bloud*. Secondly, becauſe all, as well Proteſtants, as Catholikes, agree that our Sauiour gaue his diſciples a Sacrament; and, as they ſay, a ſigne of his Body which was

Luke 22. v. 19.

Luke 22. v. 20.

1. Cor. 11. v. 25.

made

made a Sacrament by vertue of these words, *This is my Body*: therefore it were an impiety to say that our Sauiour gaue bread to his disciples before these words were pronounced; for then he had giuen a meer peece of bread, and neither Sacrament, nor his Body, nor signe of his Body. Thirdly, if our Sauiour had perfectly giuen that which he put into the disciples hands, before he had pronounced the words of consecration. the Scripture saying, *he tooke bread, brake, and gaue to his disciples, and sayd, This is my Body.* then it would follow by the same argument that our Sauiour gaue bread, that is to say, put bread into the hands of his disciples before they tooke it into their hands, which is impossible: or, that he bad them take what they had already taken, which were absurd, because S. Matthew relates the institution so, that he mentioneth first *gaue*, and then *take* Iesus tooke bread, and blessed, and brake, and gaue to his disciples, and sayd, *take, eate, this is my Body.* If indeed the Scripture had affirmed that our Sauiour gaue to his disciples, after he had sayd, *This is my Body*, the argument had been of force: but seeing it sayes not so, but only mentioneth first, *gaue*, and after, the words of consecration, as it mentioneth *gaue* before it mentions *take*, and that common sense tells vs they must be done at the same tyme, there is nothing against the

reall preſence by this rather miſtake them argument.

Obiection 3.

S.Paul obſerues, that after he brake and gaue, he ſayd, *This is my Body which is broken for you.*

Anſwer.

S.Paul's words, according to the Proteſtant tranſlation, are theſe, *tooke bread, and when he had giuen thankes, he brake it, and ſayd, Take, eate, This is my Body.* where there is no expreſſe mention of giuing to his diſciples at all: and therefore what the obiection here affirmes, that S.Paul obſerues that after *he brake and gaue*, he ſayd, *This is my Body*, is very farre from truth. Againe, though S.Paul ſayd, *This is my Body*, yet he ſayes not that after he brake, he ſayd, *This is my Body*, as the obiection affirmes. Neither ſayd S.Paul, *when he had broken, he ſayd, Take and eate*, as he ſayes, when he had giuē thankes, *This is my Body*: for that would haue ſome ſhew of proofe that he pronounced the words after he had broken; but only affirmes, he brake and ſayd, *This is my Body*: which words may as properly ſignify that he brake and ſpake theſe words morally at the ſame tyme, as that he firſt beake, and then pronounced them. As when it is ſayd in S. Matthew, *In thoſe dayes came Iohn Baptiſt preaching in the deſert, and ſaying, Repent* &c. where,

where, though *ſaying* be put after *preaching* in the text, yet no man is ſo ſenſeleſſe as to thinke that he preached before he ſayd ſomthing; or, that he preached before he ſayd what the Euangeliſt affirme him to haue ſayd as the ſubiect of his preaching, *Repent* &c. So alſo in Iob different tymes Almighty God, Iob, and his friends are affirmed in the Engliſh Bibles, then Iob *anſwered and ſayd* &c. Then the Lord *anſwered and ſayd* &c. where, though *anſwered* be put before *ſayd*, yet no child will imagine they anſwered before they ſpake, or ſpake before they ſayd what the text affirmes them to haue ſayd. Iob 21. &c alibi.

Whence it is moſt euident, that words which are ſet one after another, ſignify not alwayes, nor euer certainly (meerely becauſe they are ſet one before another,) that the actions done and ſignifyed by them, follow one another iuſt as theſe words do. And ſo meerely thence can be drawn no forcible argument in this particular. And yet if we ſhould grant for other reaſons and circumſtances, that our Sauiour brake the bread before he pronounced the words of conſecration, whilſt it was yet but bread; what would this helpe our aduerſaryes, or hurt vs? for then it would follow, that bread was broken whilſt it remained in its own ſubſtance; but giuen to the diſciples after it was changed into the Body

of Chriſt, or morally ſpeaking whilſt our Sauiour was giuing it vnto them.

Obiection.

Here wee ſee plainly (both by theyr own rules, and our Sauiours actions) that it was bread which he brake, and gaue, and not the ſpecies of bread which was broken and giuen, that is to ſay the bredth, coulour and taſt of bread, but noe bread.

This word *broken* muſt needs haue relation to that bread broken before he ſayd, *This is my Body*, becauſe he did not break it againe after he ſaid, it was his Body.

Anſwer.

If we vnderſtand by *broken* mentioned by S. Paul when he ſayd. He *brake*, and ſayd, *Take, eate, this is my Body*, that he brake the bread changed into his Body by conſecration, or in a morall vnderſtanding, whilſt he changed and conſecrated it by theſe words, *This is my Body*, it might happily containe no great abſurdity, to grant that this ſecond word *is broken* may haue relation to the former *he brake*: for in both of them (according to this opinion) his Body was myſterionſly and ſacramentally broken for vs.

But if we vnderſtand by *brake*, as the Obiection ſuppoſes vppon a falſe ground (as I haue

haue already demonſtrated) the breaking of naturall bread before he ſayd *This is my Body*, then it is wholy falſe, and iniurious to our Sauiour and the worke of our Redemption to vnderſtand that theſe words *whith is broken for you*, haue relation to brake which was mentioned before. For that were to ſay, that *a meere piece of bread*, before it was made either a Sacrament, or his Body, or ſo much as a ſigne of his Body, *was broken for vs*; which neither Catholike, nor Proteſtant, nor Chriſtian doth or can affirme without blaſphemy: for before theſe words, *This is my Body* were pronounced, all agree that the bread was neither made his Body, nor any Sacramētall ſigne of it. Neither can it poſſibly ſtand with the other Euangeliſts, that *broken* here ſhould be only a breaking of common and naturall bread before it was made a Sacrament by theſe words, *This is my Body*: for it is certaine that S. Paul here vnderſtands by *broken for you*, the ſame which S. Luke ſignifyes by *this is my Body which is giuen for you*; eſpecially ſeeing that by *breaking* & *giuing* thinges belonging to eating, whether temporall or ſpirituall, the ſame thing is ſignifyed in many places of Scripture, according to the Hebrew phraſe. Now to ſay, that a piece of naturall bread vnconſecrated, was giuen for vs, is an intolerable blaſphemy. And yet this is clearer in the other ſpecies of the chalice:

Mark.14. v.24. Matth. 26.v.28. chalice: for S.Marke relates it thus, *This is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many.* and S.Matthew, *Which shall be shed for many for the remission of sinnes.* Which no hart truly Christian can imagine to haue any relation to pure and common wine before consecration.

To that which the Obiection adds, that therefore *broken for you* must haue relation to that bread broken before he sayd, *This is my Body*, because he did not breake it againe after he had sayd these words: I answer first, that it can neuer be prooued from the words of S.Paul, that the first breaking here mentioned by S.Paul, was not presently (speaking in a morall sense) after these words were pronounced; for though it be mentioned before, yet it followes no more thence that it was not presently after, then when S.Marke sayes, speaking of the chalice, *and they dranke all of it* before he mention the consecration of the chalice, that the disciples dranke not after the consecration of the sayd chalice, and after it was made a Sacrament, as all do and must grant they did. and so there will not be two actuall breakings, but one actuall or mystycall or Sacramentall togeather signifyed by these two words *breake*, and *broken for you*, which happened after consecration.

But if we say that the first breaking was before consecration, and the second *broken*

for

for you, ſignifyed ſomthing done after conſecration, that is, the giuing of Chriſts Body for the remiſſion of ſinnes, as the Euangeliſts ſeeme to ſignify, then it will not be neceſſary that either the bread ſhould haue beene twice viſibly broken, or that *broken for you* ſhould haue relation to the bread broken before he ſayd, *This is my Body*, as the obiection contends.

Obiection.

But to proceed from his actions to the words IESVS added, *Take, eate this is my Body*. The vnderſtanding of theſe words depends principally vppon the explication of the word *this*. we ſay, by the word *this*, Chriſt meant that which he held when he ſpake the word *this*, becauſe tranſubſtantiation is not yet made till the words following, *This is my Body*, be fully pronounced. They expound all the fower words *This is my Body*, thus: vnder the ſpecies is my Body: but enquire of them what is it which was vnder the ſpecies when Chriſt ſpake only the word *this*; and they confeſſe that it was as yet bread: which is the ſame that we mayntaine againſt them. It is bread then: and by conſequence, *this* there ſignifyes bread that I hold: and theſe words, *This is my Body*. are as much as, *this bread is my Body*.

Anſwer,

Auſwer.

The maine diffiulty here vrged, is about the word *this* in the words of conſecration, *This is my Body*. I demand firſt, when our Sauiour changed water into wine in the mariage of Galilee, whether he could truly haue ſayd theſe words vppon the water, *this is wine*, and by vertue of theſe words changed the water into wine. the water remayning when the word *this* was pronounced by him, and changed into wine when the whole propoſition, *this is wine*, was ſpoaken, as wee hold it happens, in the change of bread into the Body of our Sauiour in the Euchariſt.

I ſcarce thinke that any Proteſtant will be ſe bold and temerarious as to deny that God can do this; and yet all the difficultyes that are inuented and vrged againſt the word *this* in the words of conſecration, are the very ſame here, as is manifeſt. So that the obiection about the word *this* proues not only (if it proove any thing) that the Body of our Sauiour is not de facto put really in the place of bread by vertu of theſe words *This is my Body*, but that it is wholy impoſſible for our Sauiour to worke any ſuch change by vertu of theſe words: for, if whilſt the word *this* is pronounced, water (being only there actually) muſt neceſſarily be ſignifyed by the word *this*, as

the

the obiection conteds, then it is impoſſible by vertu of this propoſition *this is wine*, that water ſhould be changed into wine: for the ſignification of this propoſition *this is wine*, would require the preſence and continuance of water by reaſon of the word *this* which is ſuppoſed to ſignifie water: and the change of water into wine would require the abſence or non exiſtency of water, it being ſuppoſed to be *changed into wine*, and ſo water would be and not be at the ſame tyme, which is a formall contradiction, and acknowledged by all to be wholy impoſſible. So bold are Proteſtants in reſtrayning and limiting the Omnipotency of God to defend their own groundleſſe phantaſies, who oppoſe the Romane Church in this manner. And therefore the more moderate and conſiderate amongſt them grant this to be poſſible; and ſoe vrge not this argument becauſe it proues either too much, or nothing. Secondly demand, when our Sauiour ſayd, *this is my command that yee loue one another*, what was meant by the word *this*? either ſomthing, or nothing was meant by it: if ſomthing, that was either the cōmand which he gaue after the pronuntiation of the word *this*; and ſo ſomthing which was not when he pronounced the word *this*, was vnderſtood by it. And then in our preſent queſtion why cannot by the word *this* ſomthing be vnderſtood

Iohn. 15. v. 12.

ſtood which was not at that inſtant when he pronounced the word *this*. Or by the word *this* in the former ſpeech of the command, was vnderſtood ſomthing which was not his command: but this is abſurd; for then he ſhould haue ſayd *that which is not my command, is my command*. if it be ſayd, that nothing was vnderſtood by the word *this* it will follow, that the word, *this* ſignifyed nothing; and ſo his command was nothing, or nothing was his command, or the word of God ſignifyed nothing all which is abſurd.

Hence therefore it euidently followes, that the word *this* in the text *This is my command that yee loue one another* &c. cannot haue any other ſenſe ſaue this. *This which I am preſently to ſay to you, to wit, that yee loue one another, is my command*. and this ſenſe, and manner of ſpeech is ſo ordinary, both in holy Scripture, and common diſcourſe, that there can be no difficulty in the vnderſtanding of it: for it is not neceſſary that the thing which is ſignifyed by the word *this* in ſuch manners of ſpeech be then exiſtent, or in being when the word *this* is pronounced; for it may be either paſt, or to come. thus it is ordinary to ſay in the day tyme, *I hope to ſleepe well this night*, that is the night *to come*: or, in the morning, *I haue ſlept well this night*, that is, *the laſt night paſt*. and this, not only by reaſon of the thing it ſelfe whereof

Iohn 15. v. 12.

we

we ſpeake, but alſo in regard of the meaning and intention of the perſon who ſpeakes: for words were not inſtituted to ſignify thinges and obiects only, but alſo, (and that more immediatly) the thoughts and affections of him who ſpeakes: and hence it comes to paſſe, when the ſame word ſignifyes many things, it is to be explicated and taken in that ſenſe only which appeares to haue beene intended by them who ſpeake. hence, therefore it happens, that, ſeeing things not yet in being when the word *this* is pronounced, may be vnderſtood by it, we muſt gather that a thing not yet exiſtent, is to be vnderſtood when it appeares by other cleare circumſtances, that the meaning and intention of the ſpeaker is, to ſignify ſomthing which is not actually when the word *this* was pronounced, but after is to be.

Thus in the forenamed example, where our Sauiour ſayd, *This is my command, that yee loue one another*, it is cleare that his meaning was, by the word *this* to ſignify that which he was preſently after to ſay; and not what was iuſt then when he ſayd the word *this*. for then no command was giuen. And that this ſignification of the word *this*, is moſt common and familiar, euen in ordinary diſcours, is manifeſt in a thouſand inſtances: thus when I beginne to draw a circle, and when I haue drawn,

only thus much of it C (preciſely when I ſay the word *this*) I may truly ſay *this is a circle*: wherby my meaning is not, *this c beeing a little part of a circle, is a circle*; (for that is no circle) but, *this figure which now I am a drawing, or ſhall preſently draw, is a circle.* Thus, if one beginning to power wine into a glaſſe, when he hath powred ſome few dropps, or ſmall quantity, into the glaſſe, ſhould ſay, *this is a glaſſe full of wine*, it being only full when the laſt word *wine* is pronounced, certainly the word *this* cannot ſignify that ſmall quantity of wine which was in the glaſſe preciſely when the word *this* was pronounced; for that is not a glaſſe full, but the wine which he is then a powring into the glaſſe, till he haue filled it with wine, muſt be ſignifyed by the word *this*. In the ſame maner, if one deſirous to ſhew to another, how quikly flax becomes fire, holding flax in one hand and a candle in the other, flax being in its own naturall ſubſtance in that precize inſtant, when the word this is pronounced, ſhould ſay *This is fire*, and as he pronounces the words, he kindles the flax, ſoe that when the whole ſentence, *this is fire*, is pronounced, the flax is kindled, and changed into fire, noe man can be ſoe ſimple to thinke, that his meaning is, this flax remaing as it now is vnkindled, is fire, but this which I am now a ſhewing, to wit, flax kindled *is fire*; noe other wiſe

wiſe happens it in our preſent caſe, where our Sauiour, by the word *this*, intends not to ſignifie, this bread remaining as it now is, when I prunounce the word *this* is my Body, but being conſecrated, and by conſecration changed into my Body, (as flax by being kindled is changed into fire) *is my Body*. This ſuppoſed, as a ground of this truth, I anſwer to the whole diſcours of the obiection, that, when our Sauiour ſayd, *this is my Body, this is my Bloud*, his meaning was, *This which I am to giue vnto you. and which yee are preſently to eate and drinke, is my Body and my Bloud:* which, though it were not exiſtent actually then when he pronounced the word *this*, yet it was to be preſently after; no otherwiſe then when he ſayd, *this is my command*; not of any command which was then giuen, but of one which he was preſently to giue when he had pronounced the word *this*. That this was the meaning of our Sauiour in the inſtitution of this Sacrament, is moſt cleare to all ſuch as vnderſtandingly reade the text for he commanded his diſciples to *take and eate* what he was inſtituting in this holy Sacrament, *Take, eate, this is my Body*. Therefore his meaning was to ſignify by the word *this*, that which his diſciples were to take and eate. now his diſciples were not to take and eate any thing but what was inſtituted and made a Sacrament

before it was eaten: neither was the Sacrament inſtituted but by the words of conſecration, *This is my Body*; which I haue allready proued. Therefore the word *this*, according to our Sauiours meaning, muſt ſignify ſomthing which was to be after the words of conſecration, *This is my Body*. So farre from truth is it that by the word *this*, our Sauiour intended to ſignify that which he held in his hands whilſt he preciſely pronounced that word *this*, that he ſignifyed that which he was to giue out of his hands, and put into the hands of his diſciples: and therefore he ſayes not *ſee, behold*, but, *take, eate, This is my Body*; that is, not what ye now ſee whilſt I ſay the word *this*; but what I command you to take and eate preſently, *is my Body*. And yet this truth is made clearer in the inſtitution of the chalice, *And he tooke the cup, and gaue thankes, and gaue it to them, ſaying, drinke yee all of this; for this is the Bloud of the new Teſtament, which ſhall be ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſins.* where our Sauiour renders the reaſon why he commanded them to drinke of it, becauſe it was his Bloud, &c. So that he ſayes not, *looke yee all on it, for this is my Bloud*, &c. which might haue beene done before the words of conſecration were pronounced, or the Sacrament inſtituted, whilſt he ſayd the word *it*, or, *this*; but *drinke yee all of it*: which was not to be done till the conſecration and

Matth. 26 v. 28.

inſti-

inſtitution was paſt, as I haue already proued, and the obiection herafter acknowledgeth.

Obiection.

There is not one word which Chriſt ſpake, which we do not ſtedfaſtly beleeue to be true: for we hold, that this bread is the Body of IESVS Chriſt ſince he ſayd that the *bread* which he brake and gaue, *was his Body.*

Anſwer.

I doubt not of the ſincerity of this profeſſion for ſo much as concernes the perſon that wrote this paper: there is more want of true information of the vnderſtanding, then good affection in the will, and zeale certainly there is of truth, but ſuch an one as S. Paul deſcribes, *not according to knowledge.* For I haue clearly now demouſtrated, that the meaning of this propoſition, *This is my Body*, is not, *this bread which I now hold in my hand whilſt I ſay the words* This, *is my Body*; but, *This which I am now to giue you, and ye are to eate after it be made a Sacrament by the words of conſecration, is my Body.* Rom. 10. v. 2.

Obiection.

It is not our parts to gloſſe the word of God, or ad any thing of our own. ſince then we haue thoſe two things in the Goſpell: the

one that IESVS gaue bread; the othet, that, that which he gaue, was his Body, we beleeue both the one and the other: not as they who will beleeue the latter, but the former they will not credit: and though we could not comprehende how this may agree, that it ſhould be bread which we eate, and yet the Body of Chriſt our Lord, yet it were our dutyes to reſt without any ſcruple.

Anſwer.

The good diſpoſition expreſſed in theſe lines, will no doubt haue a great influence to induce the perſon that wrote them, to a right vnderſtanding of theſe myſterious words of our Sauiour, after a due and impartiall ponderation of what I haue ſayd concerning them, where by it may appeare that it was not bread remayning in the nature of bread, as it was before conſecration; but bread made the Body of Chriſt by conſecration; which the Apoſtles did eate and our Sauiour called his Body, and ſignified by the words *this*.

Objection.

But the Goſpell, in the line following, inſtructeth vs and draweth vs out of all difficulty. for Chriſt hauing ſayd, that that which he gaue, was his Body, added preſently that

it is

it is a remembrance, or commemoration therof.

Anſwer.

The opponent may pleaſe to remember, that iuſt now we read in the former objection, that it is not their part to gloſſe the word of God, or to adde any thing to it of their own: & yet preſently vppō it in the very next objection, the word of God is gloſſed, and ſomthing added which is their own, and not God's word. *Chriſt* (ſaith the objection) *hauing ſaid that that which he gaue, was his Body, added preſently, that it is a remembrance or cōmemoration thereof.* where, I pray you, in the whole Scripture finde you that our Sauiour ſayd in expreſſe and plaine words, as you affirme he ſaith, *that which I ſayd was my Body, is a commemoration or remembrance of my Body*? or where ſtands this written in God' word, *This is a commemoration of my Body*? or where in the whole Bible find you that our Sauiour ſo much as once pronounced theſe words, *The commemoration of my Body*? Certainly in the whol new Teſtament no ſuch expreſſe words as theſe, are to be found. Seeing therfore our Sauiour ſayes in expreſſe and plaine words, *This is my Body*, and neuer ſayes in as expreſſe termes, *that is to ſay, a commemoration or remembrance of my Body*, nor ſo much as once names *the commemoration*

of his Body, is it not to gloſſe the word of God, and adde ſome thing of your own, to affirme that he ſays what he neuer ſayd nor named in the whole new Teſtament? If therefore you ſtick to your rule iuſt now deliuered, of beleeuing the expreſſe word of God without all gloſſe or addition, you muſt ſtedfaſtly beleeue without all ſcruple, that our Sauiour gaue his true Body to his diſciples; ſeeing what you ſay of the commemoration of his Body, is no where our Sauiours expreſſe words, but your own gloſſe and addition to them.

If you anſwer, that though he ſays not in as expreſſe words, that what he gaue to his diſciples, was a commemoration of his Body, as he ſays, *This is my Body*, yet that may be gathered to be his meaning by other words: giue me leaue to reply firſt, that ſuppoſing any ſuch matter could be gathered from his words (which I will preſently proue to be falſe) yet the conſequence or collection drawn from an others words, is not to be preferred before his direct, cleare and expreſſe words to the contrary, and if you will follow the rule of good interpreters, you muſt expound the more obſcure words by the more cleere and expreſſe, and not the cõtrary as you doe here. Secondly when you draw from other words of our Sauiour this conſequence that he meant that

that that which he called his body was as much as to ſay, *commemoration or remembrance of his Body*, either you haue ſome expreſſe place of Scripture which warrants that conſequence to be good (and that place muſt be alleaged which will he as hard to find as the other propoſition *this is a commemoration of my Body*, neither the one nor the other being any where in Scripture) or you muſt beleeue ſome thing with a Chriſtian faith (as you profeſſe to beleeue this conſequence) which not withſtanding is not in Scripture: which is contrary to your own principle of *beleeuing nothing which is not in the written word of God.* and if this conſequence be not in the written word of God, then it is framed only by your own diſcours and iudgement. what impiety then would it be to preferre your own diſcours before the expreſſe words of our Sauiour, and to expound them, and draw them from their own naturall, proper and direct ſenſe, to an improper and figuratiue by a cõſequence gathered by humane diſcours only, neither expreſſed nor warranted to be good expreſſely in any place of Scripture.

Thirdly that I may giue a full and compleat anſwer to this objection ſo frequently in the mouth of euery Proteſtãt, I denie that our Sauiour euer ſpeake or meant our could poſſibly meane that that which his Apoſtles did eate,

and he affirmed to be his body, was only *a commemoration of his Body*: or that by theſe words *my Body* is vnderſtood *a commemoration of my Body.*

That this may appeare, I only contend for the preſent that in time of our Sauiours inſtitution of the Sacrament at the laſt ſuper that which the Apoſtles did then receiue and eate, was *for that time* not affirmed to be a remembrance of his Body, nor did our Sauiour ſpeake any words in the ſaid inſtitution where by he ſignified that he gaue *then* to his apoſtles a remembrance or commemoration of his body, which if I proue, I conuince euidently againſt the obiection, that our Sauiour (not hauing euer ſaid or meant it to be a commemoration of his body; and ſo theſe words, *doe this in remembrance of me*, being noe explication of the former word: *This is my Body*) gaue his true and reall body ſubſtãtially preſent vnder the forme of bread to his Apoſtles in his laſt ſupper, and conſequently that it is ſtill giuen in the ſame manner to all true Chriſtians in this Sacrament.

I haue proued, and the obiection it ſelfe confeſſes that theſe words taken in themſelues and without relation to any thing going before, are to be vnderſtood of the reall body of Chriſt, and that our Sauiour ſaid that the thing which he had in his hands, *was his body.*

I will

I will now proue that this plane and cleere ſignification of theſe words as they ſound, is not hindred or taken away by any thing following theſe words. The maine ground where vppon is built the obiection, for the figuratiue explication of theſe words is this that our Sauiour ſayes, *This is my Body which is giuen for you: this doe in remembrance of me.* and S. Paul, *This is my Body which is broken for you, doe this in remembrance of me.* From theſe textes the obiection gathers this conſequence that our Sauiour ſaith that that which he calles in the former part of the ſentēce in expreſſe words, *his Body*, in this latter he calles (by way of explication, *the remembrance or commemoration of his Body.* So that by theſe words *my Body*: he meant the remembrance or commemoration of my body: and indeed if our Sauiour had expreſſely ſaid thus, *This is my Body, that is the commemoration or remembrance of my Body*: the difficulty had beene at an end. but this was neither ſaid nor meant by him, but impoſed vppon him by a falſe gloſſe and groſſe miſtake of Proteſtants; for to ſay: *doe this in remembrance of me*, and to ſay: *this is a remembrance of my Body* are as different as to ſay when one friend lends a booke vnto an other: *read this in remembrance of me*, and, *this is a remembrance of my Body*, which euery child will ſee to be quite different: and if any one ſhould ſay that

theſe

theſe two ſayings were the ſame in meaning and ſignification he would either be thought to haue no wit, or to haue loſt what he had: for the one ſpeakes of an action which paſſes, *doe*, or *read this*: the other of a thing permanent *this thing*, or *this booke*. the one ſpeakes of *a worke done in remembrance*, the other affirmes *a thing to be a remembrance*. the one ſpeakes of a perſon, *of me*: the other of *a Body* which is but one part of the perſon who conſiſts both of ſoul and body vnited: ſo that the whol propoſition is quite different the one from the other.

Secondly though theſe propoſitions had not beene ſo different as they are, yet our Sauiour cannot poſſibly be thought to haue meant by theſe words *my Body*, *a mere remembrance of his Body*, becauſe this explication muſt be verified of the bread which was conſecrated by our Sauiour in his laſt ſupper, as it is euident. For he ſpeakes of that euen according to Proteſtants. now that could not be a remembrance of his body, for nothing is ſaid, according to Proteſtants to be a remembrance of a thing which is actually and viſibly preſent as the body of our Sauiour then was to the Apoſtles being ſeene & heard by them: neither could it be a remembrance of his paſſion becauſe we remember things paſt, not to come as the paſſion of our Sauiour then was, and ſo it ſhould haue been a type of our Sauiour,

Sauiours death, as the ceremonies of the old law were before he dyed, and not *a remembrance* or commemoration. Therefore it is euident that by the thing which he called his body in his laſt ſupper, could not be meant a remembrance of his body as Proteſtants would haue it, and ſo this explication is very falſe. Therefore when our Sauiour commanded his Apoſtles in theſe words: *doe this in remembrance of me.* he could not meane any action or thing then preſent or done at that time, but an action which he enioyned the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors to doe afterwards in the Chriſtian Church, in remembrance of his paſſion principally, which is cleerely deliuered by S. Paul 1. Cor. 11. v. 26. 27. *This is the new teſtament in my bloud, this doe as often as you drinke in remembrance of me.* where the greeke word πίνητε ſignifies, ſhall drinke, *quotieſcumque bibetis, doe this ſo often as you ſhall drinke.* and ſo it is tranſlated by Beza, in his latin tranſlation; *quotieſcumque biberitis*, as often as you *ſhall drinke*, and ſhould haue been by our Engliſh Trāſlatours, had they cloſely followed the greeke text, as they pretend to doe, but here it made not for theyr pourpoſe, and ſoe they put it eyther falſly, or at leaſt obſcurely, ſoe often as you drinke; which euidently ſhews that our Sauiour meant by: *doe this.* not any action which was done in time of the laſt

ſupper

ſupper or inſtitution and receiuing of the Sacrament by the Apoſtles, but what they were to doe in the future: and that our Sauiour in theſe words: *doe this in remembrance of me*, did not command the preſent action of eating and drinking when our Lord celebrated his laſt ſupper, is euident, becauſe had it been of the preſent action, it would follow that he twice commanded the ſame action to be done at the ſame time, for he commanded his Apoſtles to doe what was then to be done when he ſaid, *take, eate. drinke* &c. therefore to free our Sauiour from a nedeleſſe tautologie, muſt be vnderſtood the command of doing ſome thing elſe, and at ſome other time, to be conteined in theſe words, *doe this in remembrance of me*: eſpecially conſidering that the mention of remembrance could not be vnderſtood of any thing then viſibly preſent, or after to come, as I ſaid before. Theſe words therefore being to be vnderſtood of the conſecrating and frequenting of this Sacrament for the future only, cannot poſſibly be an explication of the former words, *this is my Body*, which ſpeake only of a thing that is then preſent, as is euident, and conſequently thoſe words (according to the obiection) are plainely & ſimply to be beleeued as they ſound, without any gloſſing of the words of our Sauiour (there being no ground in this place of Scripture for

any

any ſuch figuratiue gloſſe, (as I haue prouued) and each Chriſtian muſt beleeue that that thing which our Sauiour gaue his Apoſtles was his very body as his affirmed it to be.

If happily not withſtanding that this were granted, ſome Proteſtants ſhould gather from theſe words: *doe this in remembrance of me*, that this Sacrament in times inſuing after our Sauiours death was only to be a remembrance of his body, and ſo not his body, whatſoeuer is to be ſaid of that Sacrament in the firſt inſtitution. I anſwer that though ſome ancient heretiques haue been of this opinion, yet I neuer heard of any Proteſtant who held that the Chriſtians after our Sauiours time receiued not the ſame which the Apoſtles did from his hands; and ſo this obiection is to noe purpoſe for the Proteſtants.

Yet that I may cleare all difficulties which may probably occurre againſt what I haue ſaid in this matter: I anſwer that this is noe good conſequence: our Sauiour would haue this Sacrament celebrated and frequented in remembrance of him, therefore the hoaſt after the conſecration is only a remembrance of his body and not his true body: or thus, therefore that which Chriſt called his body in the inſtitution, is now amongſt Chriſtians only the remembrance of his body. for if theſe words: *doe this in remembrance of me*: were not an expli-

explication of thoſe others: *This is my Body*: in the firſt inſtitution, they will neuer be any explication of them, and ſo there will be noe reaſon to ſay that the meaning of theſe words: *this is my Body, is this: this is a remembrance of my Body*, by reaſon of theſe words: *doe this in remembrance of me*: for theſe words only ſignifie that the action here commanded, *doe this*: is to be in remembrance of me, not that the thing conteyned in the Sacrament was to be a remembrance of him. now who can doubt but the ſame perſon may doe one action in remembrance of himſelfe, that is, of ſome action which he had done before? how ordinary is it for any one to write his own workes and what he himſelfe hat done or ſuffered? did not S. Faul doe this? and was not this done in remembrance of himſelfe, doing or ſuffering ſuch things: and ſhall any thence make this conſequence: S. Paul writ this in remembrance of himſelfe, therefore he was a remembrance of himſelfe, therefore it was not S. Paul who writ it, for nothing can be a remembrance of it ſelfe: who ſees not how falſe and childiſh this diſcours is? may we not ſay the ſame of our Sauiour when he appeared to S. Thomas whom he put in remembrance of himſelfe ſuffering vppon the croſſe, when he commanded him to put his hand into his ſide, and looke vppon his hands and feet &c.

and

and shall we then say that our Sauiour was not himselfe, or that is Body was not that which suffered becauſe it did ſomething in remembrance of his body crucified? what Christian will dare to diſcours in this manner? if then our Sauiours own body that ſuffered vppon the croſſe can doe ſomething to put vs in remembrance of the ſame body crucifyed once for vs, why ſhould we denie that the ſame body ſacrificed vppon the altar, or conſecrated vppon the table of God ſhould be able to put vs in remembrance of the paſſion of our Sauiour, and of the very ſame body crucified, that is thoſe actions there done of conſecrating the hoaſt ſeparate from the chalice, of ſacrificing, of giuing to others, eating, drinking &c. ſhould ſignifie that our Sauiour there inuiſibly preſent, ſuffered for vs many yeares agoe and ſacrificed himſelfe to nouriſh vs to eternall life: and ſo our Sauiour not hauing ſaid, *this is a remembrance of my Body*, but, *doe this in remembrance of me*, by vertue of theſe words preciſely made the actions done to him in this Sacramēt, and not himſelfe or his body, a remembrāce of himſelfe as before crucified.

Objection.

So that that which he gaue into his diſciples hands being a remembrance or commemoration of Chriſt, is not Chriſt himſelfe, for nothing can be a remembrance

or commemoratian of it ſelfe; for who would not thinke him to ſpeake ſimply that ſhould ſay: I giue you this ring in remembrãce of this ring, or I giue you this booke for a cõmemoration of this book, certainly the remembrãce of things are otherwiſe then the thing it ſelfe.

Anſwer.

Though theſe words of our Sauiour: *doe this in remembrance of me*, by force of themſelues ſignifie only that the action which the Apoſtles were commanded to doe, was to be in remembrance of him, that is, of him crucified. yet ſpeaking independently of theſe words, it is noe abſurdity but a truth to grant that a thing or perſon may be a remembrance of themſelues conſidered in different circumſtances, for though nothing in the ſametime, place and circumſtances can be a remembrance or cõmemoration of it ſelfe, for that were to ſignifie *idem per idem*, the ſame by the ſame, which is abſurd: and in this ſence the obiection ſayes well; yet it would not be abſurd to ſay I giue you this ring now to be a remembrance or commemoration here after that this ſame ring was giuing you by me for who can doubt but that very ſame ring when he lookes or thinkes vppon it who receaued it, is apt to put him in remembrance that it was giuen to him by ſuch a friend ſo many dayes or yeares before and ſo at one

time

time it is a remembrance of it selfe, as considered in a nother different precedent time. Thus when friends and ancient acquintance after a long separation meet first togeather, they presently put the one the other in remembrance of themselues, and so are accoustomed to say, I remember you very well: Thus if a king or Generall should act his own part vppon a stage. he would put his subiects or souldiers there present in remembrance of himselfe fighting or becoming victorious in some precedent battel. Thus our Sauiour appearing to S. Thomas made him presently beleeue and remember that he was the same person who not many dayes before was crucified for him, and to say: *Dominus meus & Deus meus*: my Lord and my God. Hence appeares manifestly that the very same body which was giuen and that very blood which was shed for vs remaning in its own proper substance and nature in this Sacrament which it then had (but after an inuisible and diuine manner) by reason of the visible actions of consecrating, sacrificing, eleuating, and receiuing of him, puts vs in remembrance of that same body, blood and person which so many yeares agoe was giuen, shed and crucified out of pure mercy for vs. If any one here should replye that though in the forenamed instances he proued that one thing or

perſon may put vs in remembrance of themſelues in different times and circumſtances, yet the ſame thing cannot properly be ſaid to be a remembrance, commemoration or memoriall of it ſelfe euen in thoſe different times according to the ordinary cours of ſpeach amongſt men. I anſwer that when a thing remaines in its whole viſible ſubſtance as it was before, there may be ſome difficulties whether it be to be called a memoriall or remembrance of it ſelfe or noe, though it he capable of putting one in remembrance of it ſelfe, as exiſtent in ſome other time, becauſe it hath other functions and perfections properly belonging to it which being of cheefer and more primary vſe and conſequence giue the name to the thing, and ſo it is not rightly termed a memory or remembrance of it ſelfe, but when it actually reduces any one to the temembrance of it. But when a thing is ſo changed in reſpect of its proper functions amongſt men (though it remaines the ſame in ſubſtance and all other proprieties that it was) that one of the maine ends for which it is put in that manner, is to be a remembrance of what it did or ſuffered in former times, then it may properly be called a memoriall, commemoration, remembrance or memory of it ſelfe. Thus though our Sauiour appearing to his diſciples after his reſurrection in a viſible

and

and liuing forme put them in remembrance of his passion, or that he was the same who suffered, and yet because his other actions of teaching, inlightning, comforting, confirming in faith, &c. were his primarie actions he had his appellations according to to them, and not from the remembrance which he caused in them, because that was secundary and of lesse consequence. But by reason that in this holy Sacrament he hath noe vse of any of those functions or the like, but is put in an inuisible and hidden manner as the food of our soules, and the end why he is so put is cheefly to continue a perpetuall remembrance of his bitter death and passion, he is most deseruedly termed a memoriall of himselfe suffering vppon the crosse. Thus for the like reason a sword wherewith some valiant champion hath atcheeued some notable feate of armes, so long as he weares it himselfe, or any other vses it, it cannot properly be said to be a remembrance of it selfe, as the instrument of those famous exploits: but if it be hung vp as a monument for those exploits in some publike place or temple, it becomes a memoriall of it selfe as working those noble actions, and in this sense the sword of Golias vsed by Dauid in the beheading of that tower of flesch, and kept in the temple as a monument, was a true memoriall of it

ſelfe as the inſtrument of atcheeuing that victorie.

Obiection.

All that hath beene ſaid of theſe words, *This is my Body*, may and ought to be applied to to theſe, *This is my blond*, and there is nothing more conuenient then te receaue the ſame manner of ſpeech in the diſtribution of the one kinde which is in the diſtribution of the other.

Anſwer.

All that is conteined in this paragraphe of the obiections may eaſily be granted (ſuppoſing there be a right explication giuen of theſe words *This is my Body*) as conteining nothing againſt vs.

Obiection.

But as they repeate only theſe words: *This is my Body*: without relation either to that which goes before, or to that which followes after, that he tooke bread *or doe this in remembrance of me.* ſo they will forget &c.

Anſwer.

How farre this is from truth cleerely appeares by what our approued authours write in this point who moſt exactely exanime all

prece-

precedents and consequences belonging to these words, which also I haue hetherto indeauored to doe in this treatis.

Obiection.

So they will forget that this cup which our Sauiour said was his blood, was after consecration called by him the new Testament, for that it was a holy signe of the new Testament.

Answer.

The obiecter would make vs to be of a very short memory, should we forget these words which vsually we pronounce euery day in saying Masse: we therefore remember very well that our Sauiour sayd according to S. Lnke and S. Paul: *This cup is the new Testament in my blood.* but we remember not that either S. Luke or S. Paul or any other writer of holy Scripture euer alleadged this reason here mentioned in the obiection, that this sacred cup was called by our Sauiour the new Testament in his blood, for that *it was a holy signe of the new Testament*, and I would gladly haue any Protestant helpe the weakenesse of our memory by producing any clere text of Scripture where this reason is giuen, and if there be noe such to be found (as vndoubtedly there is not) then they must giue vs leaue to

eſteeme this explication (according to their own principles) groundleſſe and noe way belonging to Chriſtian faith, but a mere gloſſe framed from their naturall diſcours or rather a pure miſtake grown from their ignorance of the true meaning of the word, *new Teſtament* here, according to the Scriptures acception of that word, which that it may appeare.

We muſt not by new Teſtament here vnderſtand (as many ignorant readers of Scriptures may and doe happily miſconceaue) the bookes of the Goſpel commonly called *the new Teſtament*, for none of thoſe were then written, neither is there any one of vnderſtanding who will thinke that the cup which our Sauiour had in his hand was a ſigne of the bookes of the new Teſtament, much leſſe that by new Teſtament in our Sauiours blood ſhould be vnderſtood a ſigne of the ſaid bookes.

Secondly we muſt conceaue that the very ſame thing may be a ſigne in reſpect of one thing, and aneſſentiall and ſubſtantiall part in regard of another: thus words and ſentences are ſignes of the inward thoughts and affections of the ſpeaker, but part of his outward diſcours, and in this manner the words, *new Teſtament* were a ſigne of our Sauiours internall will and intention, but withall were a neceſſary part of the compleat Teſtament of the

the new law then inacted by our Sauiour, and ſo beare the name of the whol Teſtament, as we ſhall preſently ſee.

I anſwer therefore to the obiection, and deny that by *new Teſtament*, is vnderſtood a ſigne of the *new Teſtament*, but truly & really (though partially) the new Teſtament it ſelfe ſolemniſed by our Sauiour in his laſt ſupper not long before his death, and that in his own moſt precious blood there properly receaued and diuided amongſt his Apoſtles: whereby he certified and obliged himſelfe to be the authour, head, protectour & defendour of his law and all thoſe who ſhould truly profeſſe it by giuing what he held in his hands to the Apoſtles, and they teſtified and obliged themſelues and all Chriſtians repreſentatiuely to teach, profeſſe and continue in that law by receauing and diuiding of it amongſt them.

Now to make cleare what I haue ſayd, wee muſt alſo know in generall what a Teſtament is. In latin it is called *teſtamentum*: of woſe etymologie Iuſtinianus Inſtit. de teſtamentis ordinandis, ſayes, *Teſtamentum ex eo appellatur, quòd teſtatio mentis ſit.* it is called a teſtament, becauſe it is the teſtification of our mynde, or will: ſo that a true teſtament includes two thinges, a reall minde and intention to doe what we teſtify: and an outward teſtification of what we intend, or oblige, our ſelues to doe. ſo that

neyther this outward *testimony* without the inward *will*, nor the inward *will* without the outward *testifying of it*, can be compleatly termed a testament. not the inward will alone, becauſe that cannot be ynderſtood amongſt men ynleſſe it be externally teſtifyed: not the outward teſtimony alone, becauſe it must haue ſomething reall which it teſtifyes; but the outward teſtification as correſponding to the inward will, and exhibiting it to others, is a teſtament. now all kindes of externall ſignifications of our wills ot intentions, are not ſufficient, but ſuch as ſignify by way of a compleate confirmation, that the will of him who makes this teſtament, is ſuch as it is ſignifyed there to be: and hence it is that ſo many witneſſes, ſubſcriptions, ſeales, and other ſolemnityes are not mere ſignes, buts parts of the teſtament, as the pronuntiation of the wordes in a ſermon, though it be a ſigne of the minde of a preacher, yet it is eſſentially required as a part of the ſermon.

Now this outward part of the teſtament, or laſt compliment or confirmation of *it*, was accuſtomed to be exhibited in bloud; as witLiu.l.1. neſſes Liuie ſpeaking of a ſolemne league or teſtament made betwixt the Romans and the Exod.24. v.8. Albans and no leſſe Moyſes in Exodus, ſpeaking of the teſtament or pact made betwixt Hebr.9. v.20. Allmighty God and the Iſraëlites, ynto which

our

our Sauiour may we haue alluded in the institution of the chalice. vsing according to the first two Euangelists, the very same phrase, or maner of speech, *This is the bloud of the testament which our Lord hath made with you*, &c.

This is my bloud of the new Testament, &c. the word testament is in Hebrew ברית *Berith*, and in Greeke Διαθηκη, *diatheke*, and though the Hebrew word signify a pact, league, or solemne promise mutually obligatory betwixt two parties, and the Greeke word a testament, or last will of a person before his death, and confirmed by it, as S. Paul sayes Hebr. 9. yet because that last will is the most solemne and strong of all other pacts, or leagues, the Greeke word diatheke often signifyes a pact or promise mutuall, in Scripture. And the Septuaginta translate the Hebrew *Berith* by the Greeke *diatheke*, as S. Hierome notes Zachar. 9. 11. and Psal. 82. 1. Mach. 1. and often the English Protestant translations for *berith* put *testament*; thus they call the arke of Moyses the arke of the testament, *Berith* in Hebrew.

Gen. 9. 13.
Ps. 54. 21.
Ps 29. 34.
Ps. 105. 45

Seeing therefore in the 24. of Exodus, the bloud is there sprinkled first vppon the aultar, which supplyed the place of God, and then amongst all the people wherby, as Interpretours, and ancient authours obserue, was signifyed that the bloud of that party who first broke

broke this pact, or teſtament, ſhould be ſhed, and diſperſed as that was, and that our Sauiour in S. Matthew and S. Marke commãded his bloud to be deuided amongſt his diſciples, *drinke yee all of this*, it is ſo farre from any ſignes, or figures of our Sauiours bloud, as the opponent here imagines, that hence is drawn a moſt forcible argument, that as in Exodus there was ſhed and diſperſed true reall bloud, and not a ſigne or figure of it, which was called the bloud of the teſtament, ſo here alſo muſt needs be vnderſtood the true bloud of our Sauiour, as it is called by him; both Moyſes and our Sauiour vſing the ſame maner of ſpeach, as I haue ſhewed, and ſuch a ſolemne league or teſtament as this was, requiring no leſſe, but rather much more, to be confirmed by true bloud, then that in Exodus, or in other ancient times.

Exod. 24. v. 8.

Hebr. 9. v. 20.

And hence may clerly enough be gathered, firſt, that our Sauiour himſelfe held the cup of his bloud, to confirme this league, or pact betwixt him and mankinde, of his part, as the Apoſtles tooke it and drunke it to confirme it of theyrs; and ſo it is called, as it is, his bloud of the new teſtamens, that is, whereby the teſtament of the law of Grace was ſtregthned, confirmed, and accompliſhed on both parts. Secondly, that as in a teſtamẽt, an authenticall inſtrument drawn of any dying mans will,

wit-

witneſſed, ſubſcribed, ſealed, &c. is rightly and ptoperly called his laſt will, and teſtament; ſo in our preſent occaſion, the couenant, or will of our Sauiour, teſtifyed or confirmed by his bloud, is rightly called the new Teſtament of Chriſt, and that ſacred bloud of his as teſtifying and confirming this will, and decree, is moſt properly termed by our Sauiour, in S. Luke, and S. Paul, the new Teſtament in his his bloud, that being the authenticall inſtrument wherby this will of his was confirmed, and teſtifyed. And hence euidently appeares how vaine & falſe the explication here giuen by the opponēt is, for if here by new Teſtamēt be only to be vnderſtood a ſigne of the new Teſtament, then Exod. 24. by Teſtament ſhould be only vnderſtoud, a ſigne of the Teſtament then made betwixt God and the Iſrealites, (the very ſame phraſe being vſed in both places) which were ridiculous.

Objection.

He called the cup is bloud, in the ſame maner as he called the bread his body.

Anſwer.

Still more gloſſes, additions, and miſtakes: where did our Sauiour *call the cup is bloud?* where read you theſe woades, *this cup is my bloud?* he ſaith indeede, haiuing taken the cup,

this

this is my bloud of the new Teſtament, but neuer, *this cup is my bloud*: he ſayd, *this cup, the new Teſtament in my bloud*; but he neuer ſayd, *this cup is my bloud*, no more then he euer ſayd, *This bread is my Body*. Such propoſitions as theſe therefore, are not to be put vppon our Sauiour, vnleſſe you can eyther ſhew them in Scripture, or proue them euidently out of it.

Obiection.

And if the cup muſt be the Teſtament or ſigne of his bloud, wy ſhould not the bread be the Teſtament or ſigne of his body.

Anſwer.

The cup was iuſt now called the new Teſtament, (according to the opponent) for that it is a holy ſigne of the new Teſtament: now it is called the new Teſtament; or ſigne of his bloud; ſo that *new Teſtament* now ſignifyes *a figure of the new Teſtament*, and then *a ſigne of our Sauiours bloud*, & what it pleaſes the opponent, according to different apprehenſions and phantaſies framed of it, without Scripture or ground; ſo inconſtant are Proteſtants in theyr aſſertions! neither is therefore *new Teſtament* here, a ſigne of tha new Teſtament, nor a ſigne of our Sauiours bloud as I haue proued, but his bloud is the bloud of the new Teſtament, and the cup the new Teſtament in his bloud,

bloud; as he declares expreſſely in the Goſpell; and if that which he called here his bloud, muſt needs be (as I haue ſhewed) his true reall bloud, why ſhould not that which he called his body, be his true reall body? whether his body here may be termed the new Teſtament &c. ſeeing we haue nothing in Scripture or fathers, concerning it, I will not determine, it is a curious and needleſſe queſtion; and we ſee that the leagues betwixt perſons were confirmed by bloud, yet ſeeing it was the cuſtome both in antiquity, and in Exodus c. 14. now cited, to kill and ſacrifice the bodyes of thoſe creatures whoſe bloud they ſprinkled, and that, as it ſeemes in confirmation of the couenant betwixt them, and that here our Sauiour made a true ſacrifice of his ſacred body, putting it, as Diuines tell vs, *mortuo modo*, in the maner of a dead body, exhibiting it as ſeparate from his bloud and his Apoſtles receauing it from his hand, it might happily be termed his body of the new Teſtament, or the new Teſtament in his body vnbloudily ſacrificed; but then will follow, that here muſt be no leſſe his true body then were the true bodyes of thoſe creatures ſacrificed in Exodus the 24 or then I haue prooued his true bloud to be there by the like argument: but I will not be authour of any ſuch new maners of ſpeech,

and

and ſo conclude nothing in this particular, as conducing little to the poynt in queſtion.

Obiection.

They will not indure any figure, or impropriety of ſpeeche in theſe wordes *this is my Body*, though in affect they themſelues wreſt them, for whether by this word *this*, they vnderſtand, *vnder this*, or *vnder thoſe ſpecies*, or that they will that this word *this*, ſignifyes nothing preſent &c.

Anſwer.

I am not obliged to defend euery mans different opinion, each hath his particular reaſons, and wayes to maynteyne his own: it is ſufficient that I defend what before I haue anſweared, and demonſtrated out of Scripture, that our Sauiours meaning by the word *this*, was to ſignify nothing preciſely preſent by way of a Sacrament when the word *this* was pronounced, but what was to be preſent when the Apoſtles tooke, and ate it, or preſently before; that is, ſo ſoone as the wholl propoſition *this is my Body*, was pronounced. which ſenſe, by way of inſtance may be gathered out of the expreſſion vſed here by the opponent, when it is ſayd, *for whether by this worde, this*, and, *or that they will by the worde*, this.

for

for when the obiection ſayes, *this word*, not hauing yet ſet down the word which is meant by it, but preſently after, to witt, *this*, certainly the opponent cannot ſignify any thing preſent preciſely when theſe two words, *this word* were written, but what was preſently to be ſet down, to witt, *this*, ſo that by the opponents own writing is conuinced that the word *this* may, & doth ordinarily ſignify ſomething not preſent when it is pronounced, or written, but preſently after to be ſet down, or ſpoken.

Objection.

Or whether by this word, *is*, they vnderſtand *ſhall become*, or *ſhall be tranſubſtantiated*: ſurely theſe diſtractions can be no teſtimonyes of truth.

Anſwer.

Here again the *objection*, *puts* the word *this*, and that which is ſignified by it, to wit *is*, follows after it. To this obiection I anſwer that it is a mere calumnie forged by Caluin, and from him diſperſed amongſt the vulgar, that any Romane Catholicque Doctours by the word *is* vnderſtand *ſhall become*, or, *ſhall be tranſubſtantiated*; for though they gather, as a neceſſary ſequel, tranſubſtantiation, from the reall and proper ſignification of theſe words, *this is my Body*, yet they all vnderſtand the word

is, in its own natiue, common, and ordinary ſignification, and none of them take it for *tranſubſtantiated*, or *become my Body*, neyther indeede can they, vn leſſe they deſtroy their own principles, for if they ſhould by *is* vnderſtand, *become*, or *tranſubſtantiated*, then they muſt vnderſtand by the word *this*, *bread*; (ſeeing they all affirme that bread only becomes, or is tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt's body) but that were plainly to contradict themſelues, it being one of the mayneſt points in this controuerſy betwixt Caluiniſts and vs, they affirming that *bread* is vnderſtood by the word *this*, and we denying it.

That which is added, that, *thoſe diſtractions can be no teſtimonyes of truth*, that is, the diuerſity of opinions amongſt vs here reckoned vp, about the vnderſtanding of theſe wordes *this* and *is*, ſeemes to me to haue ſomething of that eye condemned in the Goſpell, which ſees a mote in anothers eye, and diſcouers not a beame in it ſelfe. The opponent ſummes here vp fower differēt opinions, whereof the laſt, I haue proued to be a falſe impoſition and no opinion of ours: the firſt and ſecond, of the word *this* ſignifying *vnder this*, or *vnder theſe ſpecies*, are one and the ſame opinion, ſet down by the opponent in different words; for ſeeing by *vnder this*, none of our Authours vnderſtand *vnder this bread*, they muſt needs

meane

meane by it, *vnder theſe ſpecies of bread*, to omit that no Catholicque Authour ſayes, that the word *this*, preciſely ſignifyes, *vnder this*, or *vnder theſe ſpecies*, &c. but, *that which is vnder theſe ſpecies, is my Body*: the third opinion, that by the word *this*, is ſignifyed *nothing preſent*, if by *nothing preſent*, be meant, nothing preſent after conſecration, it is another impoſition vppon Catholicque Authours, making them ſpeake like Caluiniſts, againſt themſelues: but if therby be meant, nothing preſent preciſely in that momẽt when the word *this* was pronounced, it is true, and Catholicque, as I haue ſhewed; but then it is not oppoſite to the former opinion, for ſeing no Catholike teaches that the body of our Sauiour is vnder the ſpecies of bread, till the ſubſtance of bread be tranſubſtantiated into it, agrees well with their opinion that nothing in particular be vnderſtood by the word *this*, which is exiſtent when that word was ſpoktn, bread being then vnder its own ſpecies. Thus, vppon a iuſt examination, we finde that in truth there is but one only opinion of Catholicques in the whol reckoning, and therefore vnderſeruedly termed *diſtractions*, or *no teſtimonies* of truth. But had the opponent put ſome reall diuerſity of opinions amongſt Catholicque Authours about the vnderſtanding of theſe words, and brought them to the number of fower, as here is a

ſhew made, yet ſeing they all agree in the proper and natiue ſignification of theſe words *This is my Body*, without all figures or improprieties, which exclude the reall preſence: this variety can be no more termed no teſtimony of truth in this poynt controuerſed, then are other different opinions of Schoolemen in many other myſteries of faith, being nothing but diuers wayes which learned men take to explicate or defend the ſame point of faith wherin they all agree againſt Infidells or Heretiques. But had the Opponent known or conſidered the diuerſityes of opinions riſen vp within the ſpace of few more then a hundred yeares, about the vnderſtanding of theſe words *this is my Body* amongſt Proteſtants, and that in the mayne ſignification of them, which Luther confeſſes to haue amounted to the number of ten before his death, and another not many yeares after rekons vp to the number of two hundred there had beene iuſt occaſion giuen to ſay, *theſe diſtractions can be ne teſtimonyes of truth.*

Objection.

In the middeſt of theſe diſcords, they make theſe words, *this is my Body*, but halfe true, for they all hold that there were two things in the hands of Chriſt when he ſpake theſe words, *his Body*, & the ſpecies of bread; wherof it fol-

ſt followeth that theſe wordes are true but of the halfe of that he held in his hands; and if he had ſayd, this is not my body, hauing regard to the other halfe of that he held, the ſpecies of bread, he had alſo ſpoken the truth.

Anſwer.

This difficulty ariſes from want of knowledge in Philoſophy, to diſtinguiſh an accident from a ſubſtance, ſo that it cannot well be ſo explicated, that the vnlearned will be capable of it; and ſo will be better vnderſtood by a familiar inſtance, euen in this preſent matter, then by a philoſophicall diſcourſe. The Opponent cannot deny but our Sauiour might haue ſayd of that which he had in his hands (*this is bread*) when he ſayd the word *this*. now I demand, ſeing according to all, there were two thinges (as the Opponent termes them) the ſubſtance of bread, and the *ſpecies* of bread, whether theſe words *this is bread* had been only halfe true, or no? if it be anſwered that they had been but halfe true, it will follow, that whenſoeuer we demonſtrate any thing; in ordinary conuerſation, ſaying, this is a man, a horſe, a tree, a ſtone &c. we ſpeake but halfe truly, becauſe there is always the ſubſtance, and ſpecies, or accidents of thoſe things, yea when S. Iohn Baptiſt ſayd, behold the lamb of God, or the heauenly

Father, *this is my beloued Son*, our Sauiour hauing both ſubſtance and ſpecies, thoſe propoſitions had been but halfe true. if it be anſwered, that this propoſition *this is bread*, is abſolutely and entirely true, then I anſwer the ſame to all that is here oppoſed; for ſpecies, or accidents are not different thinges, abſolutely ſpeaking, but relatiue appendixes, dependances, adjuncts, or exhibitions of thinges which are ſo abſolutly denominated, that is, ſubſtances; as when we ſee a perſon cloathed, it is abſolutely, and wholly true to ſay, this is Peeter, or Iohn; for though there be two things, the perſon, and the cloathes, yet the cloathes being only adjuncts, or meanes to demonſtrate the perſon whoſe they are, are not intended to be included in this demonſtration. and ſo, if one hauing only regard to the cloake of a perſon, ſhould ſay, *this is not Peter*, meaning *this cloake is not Peeter*, though he ſhould ſpeake true to ſuch as know his meaning; yet in ordinary conuerſation, vnleſſe by ſome particular ſigne he gaue to vnderſtand his meaning, he would either not be vnderſtood, or vnderſtood to ſpeake falſe, becauſe the demonſtration *this* is inſtituted in ſuch circumſtances, to ſignify the perſon or thing demonſtrable, and not their adjuncts, ot accidents. Apply this to our preſent purpoſe, and all is ſolued.

Obje-

Objection.

Now let any iudge which opinion is lesse forged, and more naturall; ours who say, *this* signifyes, that which Christ held; or that of theyrs who say *vnder this*, or, *vnder these species:* if they grant that the word *this* signifies *bread*, as they must needs, being spoken before consecration, will they make it signify nothing after consecration: can it both be somthing and nothing. If the word *this* signifie *bread*, then we must vnderstand that *this bread is my Body*, but no other thing can they make it signifie but bread: not the species of bread, why? becavse yet it was not when he sayd this; not his body, for his body could not signify his body, neyther as yet was it consecrated when he sayd *this*: they must therefore confesse it to signify bread, or nothing: if bread, then of bread he sayd, *This is my Body*; which is as much as to say, this bread is my body.

Answer.

Here is only a repetition of what hath been objected before: wherfore I referre the reader to my former answer, wherin I auoide all these difficultyes by replying that the word *this*, iust when it was pronounced by our Sauiour, neyther signified the species of bread, nor, vnder the species of bread; nor bread, nor

that which he preciſely then held in his hands before he pronounced the other words, nor yet nothing; but, *this which I am preſentely to giue you, and you are to take and eate, is my Body*: and this well conſidered, let any man iudge whether opinion is leſſe forged and more naturall; ours, which puts a plaine, proper, obuious ſignification both to the word *this*, the ſubiect, the word *is*, the copula, and the word *body*, the predicate of this propoſition *This is my Body*, agreeing with the whoㅣl context and intention of our Sauiour; or theyrs, which will haue ſignifyed a mere peece of naturall bread not yet made a Sacrament by the word *this*, and by *is my body, is a commemoration of my body*; and that not only without all ground in Scripture, but contrary to the plaine text, contrary to the myſtery here inſtituted, and contrary to common ſenſe & diſcourſe: all which I haue already proued.

Obiection.

Now that it is diſcouered what our Lord brake and gaue; what he bad them take and eate, and what he ſayd was his body: none need doubt but that the diſciples did eate, that which he tooke, bleſſed, brake, and gaue, and which he bad then eate, it was bread by their own rule; for as yet he had not ſayd *it is my Body*: if they did eate that which he ſayd was

his

his body. what can any conceiue it to be but bread? for what ſayd he was his body? was it not bread which, he tooke, bleſſed. brake and gaue, and bad them eate, ſaying it was his body. if they could diſproue the Proteſtant church in this poynt, they could neuer maintayne tranſubſtantiation by the words of inſtitution, which in all circumſtances, words, and actions of our Sauiour, is agreeable to what we beleeue; but we may ſafely conclude that the Apoſtles did eate bread, and that it remaynes bread after conſecration both by that which hath beene ſayd &c.

Anſwer.

Here the ſame thing ſeemes to be repeated twice or thrice ouer, and altogeather is nothing but a new repetition of what hath been anſwered before. only here ſeemes another objection to be pointed at, which may be framed, as it is more clearly by other Proteſtants, in this manner.

That which our Sauiours tooke, bleſſed, brake, and gaue, was bread: for certaine it is that which he tooke, was bread, and is confeſſed to haue been ſo by both ſydes: but that which he tooke, he bleſſed, that which he bleſſed he brake; that which he brake, he gaue; therefore from the firſt to the laſt, that which he gaue his diſciples, was bread. I

anſwer that all this is true; for it was bread in denomination both which he tooke, bleſſed, brake, and gaue; but the bread which he tooke, was bread remayning in its own nature, the bread which he gaue, was *bread made his body*, and yet it was the ſame bread *in* denomination; for the very ſame bread which was yet in its own nature when he tooke it, was made his body when *he* gaue it.

Now if one ſhould reply that this is ſayd gratis, and ſeemes to be a mere ſhift, for obſcuring and inuoluing the matter to eſcape the difficulty, or rather an explication deſtroying and contradicting it ſelfe; I will ſhew that this is ſayd with great ground, euen in Scripture it ſelfe: for if an Infidell ſhould oppoſe the change of water into wyne, in the ſecond of S. Ihon with the like argument, & ſay, that that wherewhith the ſeruants filled the veſſels at our Sauiours command, was that which they drew out of the veſſels; that which they drew out, was that which they carryed to the maiſter of the mariage-feaſt; that which they carryed to him, he drunke; but that which the ſeruants filled the veſſels firſt withall, was water; therefore that which the maiſter of the feaſt, drunke, was water. A Chriſtian vnto ſuch an objection may anſwer, that all this is true; if we reſpet only the name or denomination of the thing: for that which was put

into

into the veſſels, the maiſter drunke, and as it is true that water was put into them, ſo is it true (to ſay) that the maſter of the feaſt drunke water; but the very ſame water which remayned in its own nature when in was put into the veſſels, was denominated *water made wyne*, when the maiſter drunke it.

And that this may appeare to be no fiction of myne, all that I affirme herof, is plainly deliuered in the Proteſtant Bible the words are theſe. *Ieſus ſaith vnto them, fill the water-pots with water.* here behold water was to be put into them; *and they filled them to the brimme:* ſee here is water put into them by the ſeruanrs. *and he ſayd vnto them, draw out now, and beare to the gouernour of the feaſt, and they bare it.* marke yet here, the ſeruant bare it, that is, that which they had put into the veſſells, which was water. *when the Ruler of the feaſt had taſted the water which was made wyne and knew not whence it was,* behold it is ſtill called water, not water remayning in its owne being, but water made wyne: *but the ſeruants which drew the water, knew*: ſtill it is called water: and *the water*, that is, the very ſame that it was in denomination, when it was put in, but *changed into wyne*. Apply this in each particular to the preſent myſtery, and it will appeare how light the objection is, fit only to deceiue vnlearned people who are not acquainted with ſuch ſubtilityes, and ſophiſmes Ioa. 2. v. 7, 8. 9.

phiſmes as ſuch like objections conteyne.

Obiection.

And likewiſe that S. Paul called the conſecrated bread, bread three tymes after conſecration: for as often (ſayth he) as you eate *this bread*, and ſo let him eate of *this bread*, and whoſoeuer eates *this bread* vnworthyly; but we do not eate till after conſecration: it is then bread after conſecration.

Anſwer.

I haue giuen iuſt now a full anſwer to that which is obiected here, that S. Paul calls the hoaſt *bread* three tymes after conſecration: for it follows no more that therefore it ſhould be *pure bread*, remayning as it was before the words of conſecration; then that the *water* remained in its own nature after it was made *wyne*, becauſe after the change it is called *water*.

1. Cor. 11. 10. 28.

Neither doth yet S. Paul (if his words be well marked) ſay that the conſecrated hoaſt is naturall and common bread, ſuch as it was before, fit to be eaten at an ordinary table, as the Proteſtants muſt grant it not to be: for at the leaſt it is ſacramentall bread, and conſecrated to a religious and holy vſe, according to them, and therefore though he had put the ſame word *bread*, before and after conſecration, yet it follows not that the ſignification of that word after conſecration ſhould be the

ſame

ſame with the ſignification of the ſame before conſecration; for before it ſignifyes common, ordinary, naturall, and vſuall bread; but after, ſacramentall, ſignificant, cõmemoratiue, holy, diuine bread, according to Proteſtants, and therefore if Proteſtants muſt confeſſe that though the word be the ſame, yet the ſignification is not the ſame, why blame they Romane Catholicques if they giue the ſame anſwer, ſaying that by the word *bread* in S. Paul, before conſecration, or bleſſing, is meant the ſubſtance of naturall, and vſuall bread; but after conſecration, ſupernaturall, heauenly, ſpirituall, diuine bread; which our Sauiour termeth himſelfe to be, in the ſixt of S. Iohn, ſix or ſeauen different tymes, and which euery Chriſtian chiefly begs of God in the Pater noſter, or Lords prayer, ſaying, giue *vs this day our dayly bread*; for it is to be noted, that bread in greeke, familiarly in holy Scripture is taken for all manner of meate, and not for *bread* only, as it is diſtinct from all other meates.

But to make it yet clearer that S. Paul did not meane naturall bread remaning in its own ſubſtãce as it was before, when he called the Sacrament *bread* after it was conſecrated or deſigned for a part of that holy myſtery: it is particularly to be reflected on, that in this acceptiõ he neuer calls it abſolutly bread, but

but allways with in article determinatiue or restrictiue, referring it to that which consecration had made it; and so he calls it, *this bread, this cup, that bread, that cup*, to wit, which was held for a Sacrament, and mystery amongst Christians by force of our Sauiours *words*: and to put vs out of all doubt that it was not that naturall bread and wine, which it was before it was consecrated, he clearly calls it the bread of our Lord, and the cup of our Lord, v.29. *wherfore whosoeuer shall eate this bread, and drinke this cup of our Lord vnworthily.* &c. and as we gather Ioan.6. v.48. that when our Sauiour termed the bread whereof he spoke there, *the bread of life*, he meant not naturall and visible bread, but supernaturall and diuine; in the same manner are we to gather from the words of S.Paul, that by the like phrase the like bread is signifyed; and as our Sauiour termes that bread wherof he spake Io.6.v.51. 58. *this bread*, to distinguish it from naturall and vsuall bread, and to signify that he thereby meant his true body, so also doth S.Paul here: neyther can it more be gathered, from the being tetmed bread by S.Paul, that is naturall, and substantiall bread, then it can be gathered from the canon of our masse, that wee beleeue, it to be the substance of bread, because it is often called bread in the said canon, after consecration.

Obje-

Objection.

If by this word *bread* ſo often repeated by the Apoſtle, he ſhould vnderſtand fleſh, were not he worthy to be blamed to entertayne the people in errour, ſince he knew that ſenſe and reaſon giueth in euidence, that it is bread, which man naturally beleeues; would he not rather haue aduertiſed vs to hold our ſenſes in ſuſpenſion, and to beleeue that it is his fleſh though it ſeemeth bread, then to ioyne himſelfe with the report of our ſenſes, calling it alwayes bread without any explication?

Anſwer.

We are not to preſcribe to the holy Ghoſt what he is to diſcloſe to the writers of diuine Scripture: he could haue deliuered many other myſteries of our faith in clearer words in the holy Scripture then he hath done, if it had ſeemed good in his diuine Prouidence, and therefore though he command vs not here in expreſſe termes, to deny our ſenſes, and to beleeue that it is his fleſh, though it ſeeme bread (as ſome holy fathers haue done with in the firſt fiue hundred yares) yet he calles it as expreſſly the body of Chriſt, as he calls it bread: and ſeeing we finde bread often to be taken in a ſpirituall ſenſe in holy Scripture for the food of out ſoules, but neuer finde

the

the *body of Chriſt which is giuen for vs*, to be any other then *his reall true Body*, one would thinke that the darker or more doubtfull word ſhould in any reaſonable mans iudgement yeeld to the more cleare and certaine, and be interpreted by it then the contrary which is here alleadged: and though our Sauiour call his *fleſh bread* twice as often as S. Paul calls that which was conſecrated bread here, Ioannis 6. yet no man dare from thence argue that his fleſh was not true fleſh, but corporall and materiall bread.

Ioan. 6.

And if S. Paul by calling it ſo often bread after conſecration, ſhould ioyne himſelfe with the report of our ſenſes, as the opponent here affirmes, he would draw vs alſo to thinke that it is mere naturall, and vſuall bread after conſecration, as it was before, and therefore we may apply the ſame objection in almoſt the ſame wordes, againſt Proteſtants, which here is brought againſt vs; in this manner: *If by this word bread ſo often repeated by the Apoſtle he ſhould vnderſtand a Saeament or myſtery as it is beleeued to be amonſt all Chriſtians, were he not worthy to be blamed, to entertaine the people in errour ſince he knew that ſenſe and reaſon giueth in euidence that it is vſuall and common bread, which man naturally beleeues, would he not rather haue aduertiſed vs to hold our ſenſes in ſuſpention, and to beleeue that it is ſacramentall and ſpirituall bread, though it*

ſeeme

ſeeme vſuall bread, then to ioyne himſelfe with the report of our ſenſes, calling it always bread without any explication? Thus whilſt Proteſtants frame arguments fitter for Infidells then Chriſtians, againſt vs, they neuer conſider what force the like arguments haue againſt themſelues.

But it is very vntrue that S. Paul called it bread without any explication, or that he any way draws vs to what our ſenſes would iudge if they were left to themſelues, but eleuates our thoughts vnto faith telling vs that it is *panis & calix Domini*, the bread, and cup of our Lord, which our Sauiour confeſſes himſelfe to be. Iohn the ſixt: and beſides, that he who eats this bread, and drinketh this cup of our Lord vnwortily, *ſhall be guilty of the body and bloud* of the Lord, which giues enough to vnderſtand what kind of bread, and cup he meant here: for they cannot be properly ſayd to be guilty of the body and bloud of Chriſt, who receiue vnworthily an externall ſigne, or remembrance of it, (though otherwiſe they may highly offend him) as a ſubiect cannot be rightly ſaid to be guilty of the body and bloud of his King; who receiues not his ſeale or ſignet with that reuerence which becomes a ſubiect te ſhew to his Prince; but in the opinion of Catholikes, it is litterally and propetly true, being a moſt high affront and iniury done to the very body, and bloud of

Chriſt there preſent : and yet this is more clearly inſinuated in the 29 verſe: for he that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelfe, not *diſcerning* the Lord's body : where the Greeke word διακρίνων ſignifies a determinate iudging one thing from another, which is cleare in Catholique doctrine, but not eaſy to be vnderſtood, in the Proteſtant; for how can one be ſayd properly to diſcerne that which he acknowledges not to be preſent in that thing which he receiues Vnworthily? and though happily in ſome improper and far fetcht ſenſe, this might be ſayd, yet according to the true rule of interpreting holy Scripture, we muſt vnderſtand the wordes of it in a proper ſenſe when nothing compells to the contrary, as the Opponent acknowledges.

Obiection.

And which is more, attributing to this bread, things which cannot agree to the Body of Chriſt, to wit, to be broken.

Anſwer.

I haue before anſwered to this, and ſhewed that the word *broken* is familiarly taken for *giuen*, by way of diuiſion, or diſtribution amongſt many; which is vſed by other Euangeliſts: ſo that *giuen* and *broken* here may ſignify

fy the same thing. But if by *broken* be vnderstood a breaking in peeces of that which was whol before, who can deny that such a breaking agrees with the Body of our Sauiour absolutely speaking? was not his sacred flesh all torne, and broken with the nayles, thornes, and scourges: as the Prophet foretolde, *ipse attritus est propter scelera nostra*, he was broken for our wickednesses. and though naturall bread be properly sayd to be broken; yet it cannot be affirmed by any Christian, to be broken *for vs*, as the Apostle here sayd it was, that is, for our saluation, as onother Euangelist affirmes of the chalice. And therefore Christians must beleeue and confesse quite contrary to the Opponent here, that S. Paul is attributing here to this bread, that which cannot agree with naturall bread, but only with the true Body of Christ, to wit, to be broken for vs, as that only was mystically in this Sacrament; by may of an vnblondy sacrice: and visibly vppon the Crosse. Isay 53. 5.

Obiection.

And Christ himselfe called the cup. after consecration, the fruit of the vine, both in S. Matthew, and S. Marke.

Answer.

But in S. Luke, he calls the cup as much the fruit of the vine before consecration. There- Luke 22. v. 22.

fore if you vrge S. Matthew and S. Mark's authotity for the one, giue vs leaue to vrge S. Luke's authority for the other, and know that you haue concluded nothing, vnleſſe you proue that we are rather to ſtand to the narration of S. Matthew and S. Marke, then of S. Luke, which here you haue not done. Certaine it is that there can be no contradiction nor oppoſition amongſt the Euangeliſts: therefore ſeeing S. Luke relates theſe words, *I will drinke no more of the fruit of the vine*, &c. before the inſtitution of the Sacrament; and the two former Euãgeliſts after: and yet none of them expreſſly affirme that our Sauiour ſayd theſe words after or before the Sacrament was inſtituted, though one put them before, and the other after, we muſt gather by the context and other circumſtances, whether indeed they were ſpoken by our Sauiour before, or after the conſecration of the chalice.

That this may be vnderſtood. Nothing is more otdinary with the Euangeliſts (as all Interpreters note) then to ſet things down by tranſpoſition, or anticipation, ſomtymes putting things iuſt in that order they happened: ſomtymes tranſpoſing them into a former or latter place. This ſuppoſed, it is more probable that S. Marke ſets down thoſe words, out of their proper place, then S. Luke. for we haue a

cleare

cleare teſtimony that S. Marke in this very inſtitution of the chalice puts thoſe words by way of anticipation, *and they drunke all of it*, out of their ptoper place, the chalice hauing not then been conſecrated, nor any of the Apoſtles hauing then taſted of it. therefore it is more likely of the two, that S. Marke vſes here a trāſpoſition, then S. Luke, who reckons all othet things in their proper places and orders, as they happened. and if there be a tranſpoſition admitted in S. Marke, it muſt be alſo one in S. Matthew. But though it were that our Sauiour ſayd theſe words after conſecration, and that by this fruit of the vine he meant reall and materiall wine, (which I will preſently diſcuſſe) yet the argument proues nothing at all againſt vs. for, onr Sauiour hauing drunke iu his laſt ſupper, true and reall wine with his diſciples, before the inſtitution of this holy Sacrament, may very eaſily be vnderſtood to haue referred words to that firſt drinking in tyme of his laſt ſupper; and ſo, in relation to that, ſay,) *I will drinke no more of the fruit of the vine*, &c. as if ſome perſon hauing firſt drunke wine, & after, ſome other drinke at a banquet, may vſually ſay, I will drinke no more of the fruit of the vine till I drinke it in my own houſe: referring, thoſe wordes only to that which he dranke firſt. neyther can I ſee how Proteſtants according to theyr

principle of beleeuing nothing but what is in Scripture can deny this explication, for ſeeing our Sauiour ſais expreſly here, I will drinke *noe more* of the fruit of the vine, &c. and that we haue noe place of Scripture which eyther affirmes, or inſinuates that our Sauiour then drank of the conſecrated chalice he muſt neceſſarily, referre his drinking the fruit of the vine, to ſome other wine which he had drunk, before the conſcration. Vnderſtanding the two firſt Euangeliſts in this manner, we clearly reconcile them with S. Luke. for he muſt probably be vnderſtood of that which our Sauiour dranke before the Sacrament was inſtituted; as according to this interpretation the others alſo muſt vnderſtand it: but it will be much harder to reconcile them if thoſe words be referred to the conſecrated chalice; for, that hauing not been yet inſtituted, according to S. Luke's ſetting down our Sauiour's words, they cannot poſſibly be referred to them. for our Sauiour according to the Proteſtant opinion, would preſently haue drunke wine in the Sacrament, and ſo muſt haue falſifyed his own words as ſoone as he had ſpoken them, promiſing then not to drinke any wine till his father's kingdome were come, and yet preſently after drinking it. which is an euident argument if we ſtand to S. Lukes relation according this

expli-

explication, that it was not materiall reall wine which he drunke in the conſecrated chalice.

And hence followes another conuincing argument againſt Proteſtants in this particular. for ſeeing our Sauiour ſayd, *I will drinke no more*, &c. and that they referre theſe words againſt vs, to the conſecrated chalice, and conſequently muſt affirme that our Sauiour dranke of it, (for he could not ſay he would drinke no more of that whereof he had neuer drunk) I demande of them, whether our Sauiour dranke this as a Sacrament? This they cannot deny: hence it will follow that he tooke it as a memoriall, or commemoration of himſelfe in their opinion: and thence it will neceſſarily follow that Chriſt had forgot himſelue, hauing need of a remembrance of himſelfe. Secondly, that a man preſent to himſelfe, can without an abſurdity take a momoriall of himſelfe. Thirdly, this memoriall was to be taken by the mouth of fayth, as they ſay, and ſo our Sauiour ſhould be depriued of his moſt diuine, all-cleare and beatificall viſion, and knowledge of himſelfe & all things, (wherby S. Paul affirmes that faith is euacuated) and led by the darke light of faith: which no Chriſtian can ſay without blaſphemy. Fourtly he commanded not himſelfe, but his Apoſtles to doe what he did in remembrance of him. and ſo there is no ground in Scripture to ſay, 1. Cor. 13. v. 8.

that out Sauiours receiued this Sacrament a a remembrance of himselfe: and yet he must haue done so if that first Sacrament had been essentially only a signe and remembrance of our Sauiour, as our aduersaries teach. If therefore our Sauiour be supposed to haue drunke of the consecrated chalice, and that he could not possibly drinke a remembrance or signe of himselfe, or his Bloud, he must needs haue drunke his own reall Bloud: for according to the Opponent, if it be not a remembrance of his Bloud. it must be vnderstood to be his reall Bloud; but if he drunk that which was his own blood, it was not wine, therefore when he sayes, *I will drinke noe more of the fruit of the vine* &c. it cannot be referred to what he drunke after consecration, but to what he drunke before, as S. Luke relates it.

Hitherto I haue argued, admitting, not granting that when our Sauiour sayd, *I will drinke no more of the fruit of the vine*, &c. he meant reall and naturall wine. now I wil shew, that though those words were referred by the Euangelist to the consecrated chalice, and vnderstood of a reall and materiall fruit of the vine; yet it is not necessary to vnderstand wine by them: for there be many fruits of the vine which may be drunk beside wine: the iuice pressed out of grapes not yet ripe, is properly the fruit of the vine, which may be drunke,

drunke, and yet is no wine; nay ſhould one preſſe the young branches, and draw liquour from them, it would be that which is here called in Greeka γέννημα, *genimen vitis*, the generation, or the thing produced naturally by the vine: and yet it would be no wine. and euen wine corrupted, and quite changed is the generation and effect of the vine: and yet it is no wine. ſo alſo in our preſent caſe, the accidents or ſpecies of wine are *genimen vitis*, the true effects or productions of the vine, & yet are not the ſubſtãce of wine, Seeing therefore here euen after conſecration, according to the Romane Catholike tenet, thoſe ſpecies remayne; our Sauiour might truly be ſayd to haue drunke ex genimine, or generatione vitis, of the fruit or propagation of the vine, though there had beene no ſubſtance of wine there, but in place therof the Blood of Sauiour vnder thoſe ſpecies. ſo that the very liter all ſenſe of the words retayned, and referred to the conſecrated chalice, conclude no more then this, that our Sauiour ſpake of the ſpecies of wine; which is properly the propagation or generation of the vine.

But the words beare and admitt as well another explication (plainly ſuting with the Romane tenet) as of the fruit or iſſue of a reall vine. For our Sauiour ſtiles himſelfe, as

the Opponent presently obserues, the vine. Why then might he not call his Blood here the fruit of the vine? and so referring it to the consecrated chalice, confirme that it was the chalice of his Blood proceeding and issuing from his Body, as the wine or species of wine proceeds from the vine.

All these explications shew how little this place proues against vs: or rather how much it aduantages our cause. But if the text be considered entirely as it stands in the Euangelists, it will neither hurt vs nor helpe them, nor so much as tuch the matter in question: for our Sauiour saith thus, *But I say vnto you, I will drinke no more of the fruit of this vine till that day that I drinke it new with you in the kingdome of my Father. Verily I say vnto you, that I will not drinke of the fruit of the vine vntill that day that I drinke it new in the kingdome of God.* where he expressly affirmes that he speakes of such a fruit of the vine as he is to drinke with them in heauen: which, whether it be materiall wine, or no, I leaue to the Protestants to consider.

Matth. 26 v. 29. Marke 14 v. 25.

Obiection.

But it might be obiected, why might they not call it bread, and the fruit of the vine? in respect they had beene so before consecration: as the serpent is called a rod: and God sayd vnto Adam, *thou art dust*, because he was made

made of duſt. But if things be named by the names of what they were before, it doth not follow that we ſhould ſo take it of the body of Chriſt. for it is not only falſe, but impious to thinke that the body of Chriſt is called bread for that it had been bread before the conſecration. the ſerpent indeed had been a rod, but the body of Chriſt had neuer been bread. So Adam was called duſt becauſe he had been duſt: but Chriſt is not made of bread. The holy Scripture ſaith well that Moyſes rod became a ſerpent, but the Scripture doth not ſay that bread was conuerted into fleſh.

Anſwer.

I anſwer firſt that we doe not ſay that the body of Chtiſt was bread before conſecration at leaſt I remember not euer to haue read any ſuch propoſition in Catholike authours: becauſe his ſacred body ſtill exiſtent viſibly and gloriouſly in heauen cannot be ſaid abſolutely to haue been bread, it hauing been made of the ſacred virgins moſt pure blood for that in its full ſenſe would ſignifie (if any ſuch propoſition were in vſe) that the thing which is affirmed to be made of an other, is not exiſtent in an other place, whilſt that whereof it is made is changed into it: as neither Adam nor the ſerpent made of the rod of Moyſes were (for then only they

begun

began to be) when the rod of Moyſes, and duſt were changed into them.

Secondly I anſwer that the objection proceeds vppon a falſe ſuppoſition, for the rod of Moyſes is not called a rod when it was turned into a ſerpent, becauſe the ſerpent had been a rod before: nor Adam duſt becauſe he was before duſt: for though it be true to ſay that that which was become a man or a ſerpent, was duſt or a rod by reaſon of the ſubiect which remaines common to them both (called in philoſophie materia prima) yet it is not true in any formall philoſophicall ſenſe to ſay: *Adam was duſt: the ſerpent was a rod:* for Adam neuer was, nor neuer could haue been any thing elſe then what his eſſence made him viz: a man and a reaſonable creature: nor a ſerpent any thing then what the being of a ſerpent requiers, to wit, to be a ſerpent. when therefore in holy Scripture Adam is called *duſt*, and the ſerpent *the rod* of Moyſes, it is not becauſe Adam was once duſt, and the ſerpent a rod (for how can that be proued out of any place of Scripture?) but becauſe Adam was made of duſt, and the ſerpent of the rod of Moyſes, which is cleerely teſtified in Scripture. ſo that the ſuppoſition and fundation of the obiectiō failing, that which is built vppon it viz: that the body of our Sauiour is called bread after conſecration by S. Paul becauſe it was

was bread before, muſt needs fall to the ground. For we ſay not that the body of Chriſt was euer bread, but becauſe that which was bread, is now become the body of Chriſt, bread caſing to be vnder thoſe accidents by vertu of Chriſts body coming in the place of it: ſo that though this ſacred body cannot be ſaid to be made of bread' as a houſe is made of wood and ſtones which remaine in their own ſubſtances to compoſe it, nor as fire is made of wood where the matter common to them both remaines, yet if there be vnderſtood only that the body of Chriſt ſucceds to the ſubſtance of bread vnder the ſame accidents and ſo iſſues from it as the day iſſues from the night, as from the terme from which it beginnes to be, as one may ſay: *ex nocte fit dies*: of the night is made the day; ſo may one ſay: *ex pane fit corpus Chriſti*: of bread is made Chriſts body, as it is myſteriouſly in this Sacrament, and might be therefore called bread after conſecration, as the wine in Cana in Galilee is called water becauſe it was made of water, and the ſerpent called the rod of Moyſes, becauſe it was made of the rod of Moyſes. or which is the ſame in other termes; becauſe that which became wine was water, and that which became a ſerpent was the rod of Moyſes which if it be reſolued into philoſophicall termes, is nothig but this, that the ſubſtantiall

ſtantiall matter which was vnited to the ſubſtantiall formes of a ſerpent and wine, was immediately before vnited to the ſubſtantiall formes of the rod of Moyſes and of water, which happens in other changes of one thing into an other.

Thirdly: it is not the ordinary way of ſpeach to ſay that all things which are made by ſubſtantiall changes were ſuch things as were changed into them: thus though fire be made of wood, or wood be changed into fire, yet it is an ordinary manner of ſaying to affirme this fire was wood: neither ſay we: theſe flowers were earth, though they were made of earth changed into them. In like manner when our own fleſh is produced of the different meates we eate, we vſe not to ſay, our fleſh was beefe, or mutton, or hearbes, or bread, or drinke &c. and yet it is made of all theſe when they are changed into our ſubſtance: and hence is true the ſame propoſition of our Sauiour in time of his nouriſhment: for his meate was as truly changed into his fleſh as our meate is into our fleſh, and conſequently the bread which he did eate, was changed by nouriſhment into his fleſh: and ſo it is true euen out of holy Scripture which ſpeakes of his eating and drincking and increaſing (and by conſequence of his nouriſhment) that the fleſh of Chriſt at leaſt in ſome part, was made of bread

bread, and yet it is not the ordinary manner of ſpeech to ſay that thoſe parts of the fleſh of Chrtſt were bread, notwithſtanding it would be *neither impious nor falſe* to ſay that ſome parts of Chriſts fleſh were once bread (ſuppoſing it were true that the ſerpent had been a rod and Adam duſt, as the Opponent here affirmes) to wit, thoſe into which bread was changed by naturall nouriſhment. if then it might be truly affirmed of ſome parts of Chriſts fleſh that they were bread in this ſenſe for-named why ſhould it be not only falſe but impious to affirme that the fleſh of Chriſt as it is in the Sacramēt (for we affirme it noe otherwiſe?) was bread? there being noe more difficulty in the one then in the other. fourthly this change being made in a way wholy ſupernaturall where noe part of the ſubſtance of bread remaines, to wit, neither forme nor matter, as we ſpeake in the ſchooles, which happens not in any naturall nor in many ſupernaturall changes, where the matter and ſubſtance ſtill remaynes, now receiuing one forme, now an other, by reaſon whereof the thing that ſucceeds may be ſayd (as the opponent contends) to haue been the thing that was changed into it: by reaſon I ſay that noe ſuch common ſubiect remaines here, but the whol ſubſtance of bread is changed into the ſubſtance of Chriſts body, it will not be ſo

proper

proper a manner of ſpeech to ſay that the fleſh of Chriſt was bread as the like would be in other naturall and ordinary changes, if that manner of ſpeech were allowable.

Fiftly, the objection miſtakes the compleat reaſon of Catholikes why S. Paul calls the Sacrament bread after the conſecration: for it is not only becauſe the bread is changed into the fleſh of Chriſt, for this might haue been done ſo inuiſibily that neither the body of Chriſt nor the ſpecies of bread ſhould haue appeared, and then we ſhould haue had nothing common to them both to haue continued the denomination of bread. but the entire reaſon giuen by Catholike Doctors is that the bread is changed into the fleſh of Chriſt which is put vnder the outward ſhewes or ſpecies of bread, which giue occaſion or ground of giuing it the ſame denomination it had before. Thus we call the dead carkaſe of a lamme a lamme, and the dead body of a man, a man, by reaſon of theſe outward organs and proportions which remaine the ſame they were before, though the thing be quite changed from what it was. Vnto that which is added that we haue noe where in Scripture that bread is conuerted into the fleſh of our Sauiour as we haue that the rod of Moyſes was conuerted into a ſerpent I *Anſwer* that it is not neceſſary to haue all things in Scripture

in

in the like clearnesse and expliciteneſſe of words, for we haue noe where expreſſed in Scripture; that the bread our Sauiour did eate was conuerted into his fleſh as we haue that the rod of Moyſes was conuerted into a ſerpent, and notwhithſtanding euen Proteſtants muſt beleeue it. ſo though we haue it not in expreſſe termes that bread is changed into the fleſh of our Sauiour in this Sacrament, as we haue that Moyſes rod was conuerted into a ſerpent, yet we muſt beleeue it, becauſe the truth of Scripture cannot ſtand vnleſſe this be granted: for ſeeing our Sauiour ſayd *This is my Body*, and it is wholy impoſſible and implying contradiction that a piece of bread remaining in its own nature ſhould be the true and reall body of our Sauiour (as we haue ſhewed that thoſe words muſt import) it followes neceſſarily that the nature and ſubſtance of bread cannot be vnder thoſe viſible ſpecies, and therefore bread muſt ceaſe to be out of the force of Chriſts body, which muſt ſucceed in place of bread, vnder the ſame ſpecies which is nothing elſe then to haue bread changed into the body of our Sauiour.

Objection.

Why ſhould they only take theſe words *This is my Body*: in a litterall ſenſe and noe other? doth he not as well ſay: I am a dore: I am a vine? doubtleſſe he was able

to transforme himſelfe into a doore, or a vine but did he therefore doe ſo? he ſaid to his diſciples: yee are branches, yee are ſheep. did they therefore become ſo in reſpect either of his power or words?

Anſwer.

I Anſwer that there is a maine difference betweene theſe propoſitions and the other where of wee treate *This is my Body* both in the *ſubiect* and in the *predicate*, that is in the *firſt* and *laſt* word of them. for the firſt word or ſubiect in the former is (I yee) which ſignifie determinately and expreſſely our Sauiour and the Apoſtles to whom he ſpake. But in the latter, the firſt word, or ſubiect is (This) which neither expreſſely nor implicitly ſignifies *bread*, but this which I am about to giue you, as I haue already ſaid. the laſt words alſo: doore, vine, vinebranches, ſheep in the former propoſitions are indetermined and fit to take a ſpirituall, myſticall and metaphoricall ſence: for he doth not ſay, *I am a doore made of wood and boardes which is vſed to ſhut and open in viſible houſes. nor I am a vine which viſibily ſpringes from the earth and beares ſuch grappes as men vſe to make wine of, neither ſaid he that his Apoſtles were ſuch ſheepe as feed in the fields, as beare wool to make cloath of as are boyled and roſted to be eaten at the table: nor ſuch vine branches as are cut of from the vine, and either rot, or are burned, or beare grappes in the*

the vine viſibly &c. For it had been an impoſſibility and a plane contradiction to affirme that liuing men remaning in there own nature as they did, ſhould be ſuch things as thoſe, truly and really, and therefore thoſe laſt words dore, vine, ſheepe, vine branches being not determined in Scripture to theſe materiall and viſible things which we commonly vnderſtand by theſe words, giue full ſcope to interpret them of things in a ſpirituall and myſticall ſenſe, in which only theſe propoſitions are true. but in theſe words, *This is my Body*: the laſt word body is not left indeterminate and applyable to a metaphoricall ſenſe as it is in holy Scripture, and the diſcours of our Sauiour expreſly determined it to ſignifie his true naturall, materiall, ſubſtãtiall body which was there preſent before the Apoſtles: for if our Sauiour had only ſaid theſe words, *This is my Body*, and added noe further explication: ſome ſcope might ſeeme to haue been giuen to haue interpreted it either of his reall or myſticall body which is his church whereof S. Paul ſpeakes: but he takes away this liberty when he addes preſently: *This is my Body which is giuen for you.* This is my blood which ſhall be ſhed for you. which cannot be vnderſtood of his myſticall body, but only of his true reall body & blood which only were giuen & ſhed for our redemption. ſo that the *ſubiect* or firſt

Coloſſ. 1. v. 14.

word of the former propoſition *I yee* being wholly determinate to thoſe particular perſons of Chriſt and the Apoſtles: and the *predicate* or laſt words: *dore, vine, ſheepe, vinebranches*, being wholy indeterminate in themſelues; neither expreſly naming *corporall* nor *ſpirituall*: ſeeing it is contrary to all reaſon and wholly impoſſible that thereby thoſe things in a corporall ſenſe ſhould be affirmed of our Sauiour and his Apoſtles, as I haue ſaid, thoſe propoſitions muſt make this ſence which is true and orthodoxe: *I am a ſpirituall dore or vine, yee are ſpirituall vine branches, or ſheepe* &c. but on the contrary the indetermination or indifferency of the firſt word or *ſubiect* of this propoſition, *This is my Body*: being conſidered in it ſelfe making it noe way limited to bread: and the laſt word or predicate, *Body which is giuen you*, being expreſſly determined to the reall and ſubſtantiall body of Chriſt, it muſt make this ſenſe: *This which I am about to giue you, is my reall and ſubſtantiall body*, which is a true and Catholike propoſition and not this: *This bread is my true and reall Body*: which implies as much contradiction and impoſſibility, as this other that Chriſt *is a dore of wood* &c. For it is as impoſſible that a peece of bread actually exiſting ſhould be the reall body of Chriſt as that *Chriſt ſhould be a wooden dore*. nay if we conſider it in greeke τοῦτο, in Latin, *hoc*, diſagreeing with

bread

bread in gendre ἄρτος *panis*, which are both maſculine, it cannot be referred to bread. Now to ſhew out of Scripture it ſelfe that our Sauiour calls himſelfe the dore in a ſpirituall, myſticall and metaphoricall ſenſe only, is cleare out of S. Iohn c.12.v.9. I am the dore, if any man enter by me, he ſhall be ſaued, &c. which is not true of a naturall dore of wood, for all ſuch as enter in by ſuch a dore are not ſaued, but ſuch only as enter by the ſpirituall dore of there ſoules which is our Sauiour. ſo alſo when he calls his Apoſtles ſheepe, he ſhewes clearely that the ſpeakes of metaphoricall or ſpirituall ſheepe: for he affirmes that they heare his voyce, or know him: and hence appeares alſo. (by the way) another miſtake contrary to theyr own Engliſh Bible which Proteſtants ordinarily vrge againſt vs, miſtaking the words of the Goſpel: they tell vs that our Sauiour ſaid he was *a dore, a vine, a way*, which he neuer ſayes according to their Engliſh Bible; but thus: I am *the dore, the vine, the way* &c. which determines the words to a ſpirituall and metaphoricall ſenſe, as when he ſayes: *I am the bread of life*, *I am the good ſheapherd* &c. and when he calles his diſciples *ſheepe*, he vſeth alwayes this reſtraining and limiting particle, *my ſheepe*: which is only true of ſpirituall ſheepe, for our Sauiour had noe other. That which the ob-

jection ſaid that our Sauiour was as able to change the Apoſtles into ſheepe as to change bread into his body, is true if the Apoſtles had ceaſed to be men and had been ſo conuerted into ſheep, as Lots wife ceaſing to be a woma̅ was conuerted into a pilar of ſalt. but then the propoſition which Proteſtants pretended out of Scripture: *yee are materiall ſheep*, had not been true: neither could the truth of that propoſition euer haue cauſed that conuerſion as conformable to it. but this propoſition only ſhould haue been true: *yee are made, or are become materiall ſheep* by vertu of a miraculous change of men *into ſheep*: noe otherwiſe then the water in the mariage in Gallilee is ſaid to be made wine: for when one thing is affirmed of an other, then that where of it is affirmed is ſuppoſed to be exiſtent, as when I ſay: *I am a man*; the perſon muſt be exiſtent where of it is affirmed that *he is a man*. but contrariwiſe when one thing is ſaid to be made an other naturally, not artificially, then that which is ſaid to be made the other ceaſed to be what it was, and is conuerted into the other; as when it is ſaid, water was made wine, water ceaſed to be and wine was made of it. and hence it is a plane contradiction to haue any change or conuerſion made in a pure affirmatiue and ſimple propoſition in this manner: *Peeter is a reall and naturall ſheepe*. for then this perſon

Peeter,

Peeter, is ſuppoſed to be and not to be at the ſome time. to be, becauſe he is affirmed to be *a ſheepe* not to be, becauſe he is changed into a ſheepe, and ſo ceaſes to be as water ceaſed to be when it was made wine. And the ſame abſurdity and contradiction had followed if our Sauiour had ſaid: *this bread which I now haue in my hands, is my naturall Body truly and really*. for bread ſhould haue remained becauſe it was affirmed to be his body and yet it ſhould haue beene deſtroyed and ſo not remained, becauſe it ſhould haue been changed into his body. I am ſorry that ſuch ſpeculations as theſe ſhould be propounded to thoſe who haue not ſtudied, but the objections require them. yet I muſt adde to make this matter out of queſtion: if the propoſitions: *I am the vine: yee are the vinebranches*, implyed any change of our Sauiour into a reall materiall vine &c. then this propoſition adioyned, *and my Father is the huſbandman*. would haue implyed a power in God the Father to be changed into a reall huſhandman and ſo God himſelfe would be changeable, wich cannot be affirmed without a blaphemy. So then as God the Father is called only a Spirituall huſbandman, ſo alſo our Sauiour a Spirituall vine, and the Apoſtles ſpirituall branches, noe more change being implied in the one then in the other. Now that many things affirmed of others, are

to be vnderſtood, of thoſe thinges as ſpirituall, not corporall, is moſt euident, 1. Cor. 10. 3. cited herafter by the Opponent, *and they did all eate the ſame ſpirituall meate and did all drinke the ſame ſpirituall drinke, for they dranke of that ſpirituall Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt.* So that as Chriſt is here called the ſpirituall Rock, ſoe is he in the places cited in the obiection, called the ſpirituall way, dore, vine, &c. which he truly and really is, without, all impropreties of ſignes, or figures, for otherwiſe,, as Proteſtants make, *this is my Body*, to be *this is a ſigne of my Body*, ſoe muſt they ſay *I am a dore*, is as much, as *I am the ſigue of a woodden dore*, which were both blaſphemous, and ridicolous, being applied to our Sauiour.

Obiection.

And if he was in a figuratiue manner a dore, a vine; why may not bread be is body figuratiuely? and why ſhould they thinke it is a leſſe change, for our Sauiour to call his body bread, then to call bread his body? doubteleſſe he called his body bread in reſpect of the nouriſhement which a faithfull ſoul receaues in the Sacrament; euen ſo the bread is the body of Chriſt ſacramentally and taketh the name of the body of Chriſt as being a ſacred ſigne or Sacrament thereof.

Anſwer.

I haue before giuen the reaſon of this diffe-

rence,

ence, for certaine it is that in this propoſition n proteſtant doctrine by the word *this*, is ignified reall and materiall bread, and by *my Body* the reall body of Chriſt, where of they wil haue this materiall bread to be a ſigne now n the other propoſition: *my flesh is meat*, or *I am the bread* &c. though the words *my fleſh* and *I* ignifie really and truly our Sauiour and his ſacred body; yet the word bread cannot any way ſignifie true and materiall bread: for he expreſſely calles it *the bread that came down om heauen: the bread that giues life to ſuch as worthyly eate it*, and *liuing bread*. which can by noe meanes agree with bread made of wheat or any other corne.

Hence therefore apeares that the fleſh of our Sauiour;,or he himſelfe are neither a Sacramēt, nor a ſigne of viſible and vſuall bread: for it would want little of blaſphemy to ſay that our Sauiour or his ſacred body *were a ſigne of a loafe of bread* which ſeeing it is ſo, there can be thence noe argument drawn that bread is called the body of our Sauiour becauſe it is a ſigne of his body: but rather the quite contrary our Sauiour or his bleſſed fleſh are tuly and really liuing bread, life giuing bread, heauenly bread, ſpirituall bread. Therefore that which our Sauiour gaue his diſciples was truly and really his reall and naturall body: or thus, that bread of our Lord, that heauenly, liuing ſpiri-

tuall which the Apoſtles receaued from the hands of our Sauiour, was his true ſubſtantiall body.

But if by the words: *this is my Body*: ſhould be vnderſtood true viſible bread, as in the obiection they are, there will be noe other parity or conſequence ſaue this: or Sauiour calls his fleſh bread becauſe it is true liuing, heauenly bread: therefore a peece of cõmon bread is called the body of Chriſt becauſe it is a ſigne of his body: which is quite out of ioynt,

Now certainely (to anſwer the queſtion here propounded) it is much leſſe ſtrange for our Sauiour to call himſelfe meat, or liuing ſpirituall bread &c. then to call a piece of wheaten bread his true and reall body; for he is truely the one, but naturall bread can neuer be the other.

Concerning the other queſtion firſt propounded, why may not bread be his body figuratiuely? if *it* had been ſet down in this manner: why might not bread haue beene his body, figuratiuely? I would haue anſwered that there is no reaſon but it might, as were the figures of the old law and amongſt them the bread of propoſition, and of Melchiſedech, and many ſuch like types of the old Teſtament: but the reaſon why it may not now be ſo in this Sacrament is becauſe I haue ſhewed that according to the

firſt inſtitution, it was our Sauiours will to change bread into his body: and ſo not being at all, it could not be his body figuratiuely: neither can a figuratiue ſenſe ſtand with the truth of this propoſition: *This is my Body which is giuen for you.* That which is laſtly added that *bread is a Sacrament of his body*, cannot ſtand with the Proteſtant doctrine: for they define in the little catechiſme in the common prayer booke a *Sacrament to be an outward viſible ſigne of an inward ſpirituall grace.* now certaine it is that our Sauiours body was as outward and viſible to the Apoſtles in the firſt inſtitution as was the bread it ſelfe, and ſo neither an inward nor ſpirituall grace, and conſequently it could not be a Sacrament of it. and if noe Sacrament, it could be noe ſigne of it. for Proteſtants acknowledge noe other ſigne here then a ſacramentall ſigne: and though after our Sauiours aſcenſion we cannot actually ſee his body by reaſon of the diſtance betwixt vs, yet that makes it not an inward ſpirituall grace, for then Rome and Conſtantinople would be ſpirituall to thoſe that liue in theſe climates becauſe for the ſame reaſon they cannot ſee them. and yet much leſſe could the body of our Sauiour, either in the firſt inſtitution or at any time after, be termed an inward grace according to Proteſtants: and yet we are not cõſtrained to acknowledge that there is not a

Sacra-

Sacrament, for it ſignifies that heauenly an diuine grace which by vertu of it *is* giuen t nouriſh our ſoules which is truly inward an ſpirituall: and that which ſenſibly appeares i it, and is called by diuines Sacramentum tan tum, is a ſacramentall ſigne of our Sauiou ſacred body inuiſibly but truly exiſtent vnde thoſe ſhewes or ſpecies in this Sacrament, an nouriſhing our ſoules and bodyes (and ſo ma be truly and properly called a ſpirituall grac or gift) and that inward alſo when it is ſacra mentally receiued. And noe leſſe is it now a ſacramentall commemoratiue ſigne of th paſſion, death and ſufferings of our Sauiou which are long ſince paſt, and ſo become now inuiſible, working myſteriouſly and merito riouſly in this holy Sacrament.

If here ſhould be replyed that hence would follow that this Sacrament might alſo in th firſt inſtitution haue been a ſigne of our Sa uiours death & ſufferings repreſenting them as preſently to follow: and ſo theſe words (*This is my Body*) might haue this ſenſe: this bread is a repreſentatiue ſigne of my body as inſtantly ſuffering and dying vppon the Croſſe: which death and ſufferings were then inuiſible be cauſe they were not then exiſtent. I anſwer that our Sauiour might haue pleaſed accord ing to his abſolute power to haue inſtituted ſuch a Sacrament, but becauſe we haue neither

in

n Scripture nor tradition that he instituted ere any such: and the words of the institution, *This is my Body*, are properly and litterally o be vnderstood when there is nothing that onstraines vs to the contrary; we denye that ny such typicall or empty signe as this was ctually constituted by our Sauiour in the institution of this Sacrament; especially seeing hat the paschall lamme represented much more liuely and perfectly the passion of Christ hen the bread and wine: and that such typicall representations were proper to the old aw which was the shadow of things to come. And for Protestants they must confesse that hey haue noe ground in Scripture for any other signe of our Sauiours passion, then by way of commemoration or remembrance, which supposes his suffering and death past, and not to come, as I haue already prouued. And though it were gratis admitted that in this Sacrament such a prefiguratiue signe of our Sauiours passion was exhibited in the first institution, yet this would noe more hinder the reall presence necessarily required by vertu of this proposition, *this is my Body* &c. hen its being now a commemotatiue signe of his said passion, as I haue declared and proued already.

Obje-

Obiection.

In the old and new Testament it is vsual to call the signes by the names of that they signifie, why then should it be thought strange that our Sauiour in this Sacrament (calling bread his body and wine his blood) should speake in the same manner.

Answer.

I haue now shewed against Protestants in these principles that there was noe sacramentall signe of the body of our Sauiout in the first institution of this Sacrament: (Christs body hauing been then as visible and present as the bread and consequently noe signe at all; and if noe signe: the true and reall body as the opponent hath granted. Though therefore where the Scripture giueth cleare euidece that there is a signe, or that it may be clearely gathered thence, that the signe should be called by the name of the thing signified, yet there is great reason where noe such euidence is, but rather to the contrary, that our Sauiour should not speake in the same manner; neither is it yet conuinced by all the textes alleadged presently by the opponent, that signes are called by the names of the things signified or be that which they doe signifie: as will appeare by the particulars.

Obje-

Objection.

Circumcision is called the couenant with God. *This is my couenant betweene me and you.* now that the word *couenant*, must be taken for a signe of the couenant, the line following sheweth, where God said: *And it shall be a signe of the couenant betweene me and you.* Gen. 17. v. 10. 11.

Answer.

There were two couenants or pacts made betweene God and Abraham in this chapter. the first ver. 1. 2. 4. 6. 7; 8. which was of the fauour of God promised to Abraham and his seed. The second v. 9. 10. 11. &c. which was of Abrahams obedience and his childrés towards God. whereto he obliged them in taking circumcision: now this second couenant was a confirmation, signe or seale of the first on Abrahams part: and so though being considered absolutely in it selfe, it was a true and reall couenant, yet in regard of the former couenant it was a signe or seale as S. Paul calls it: and so it is called here both a couenant, and a signe of the couenant that is, of the first. as if one should make a couenant with an other of inferiour note: first that he would fauour and patronize him in all things; and then that the other might shew his gratitude, and acceptation of this couenant Hebr. 4. v. 11.

nant on his part, he makes an other that once a yeare he ſhould come and wayte on him at his table. This ſecond couuenant would be as true reall a part of the couuenant or agreemẽt between them, as the firſt; and yet would be a confirmation, ratification, ſigne or ſeale of the former. Now that this ſecond was a true couuenant, is euident out of the words, for it is a true command, obligation, or iniunction of God accepted of by Abraham, which being done, God of his part obliged himſelfe to ſtand to his former couuenant of ſhewing his grace and mercy vnto Abraham and his children. So that that which the objectiõ ſaies that the word couuenant is here taken for *the ſigne of the couuenant*: if it meanes thereby that it ſignifies not a true couuenant in it ſelfe which was a ſigne of a former couuenant, is farre from the truth. And though this ſolution be cleare and cannot be queſtioned, yet if one would ſtand meerely in the words cited, one might eaſely anſwer that the obligation of circumciſion put here vppon Abraham and his children was a true couuenant, but the actuall performance and execution, that is, circumciſiõn in it ſelfe performed vppon the Iſraëlites was a ſigne of this obligatory couuenant. and ſo it is ſaid. ver. 10. *hoc eſt pactum meum* &c. *circumcidetur. this is my couuenant* &c. *euery mal child ſhall be circumciſed, that it may be a ſigne of the*

coune-

couuenant between me and you, that is, that the actuall circumciſion may be a ſigne of this couuenant. So that neither is here the *obligation* to be circumciſed, called a ſigne of the couuenant, nor circumciſion called the couuenant as the opponent affirmes, not out of Scripture, but from the Proteſtant gloſſe or addition to it. And theſe anſwers which I haue giuen are clearly confirmed by S. Paul Rom. 4. v. 11. where ſpeaking of Abraham he ſaid: *he tooke the ſigne of circumciſion*, the ſeale of the iuſtice of faith &c. *that he might be the father of all beleeuers*: where not the obligation appointed by Allmighty God to be circumciſed, but circumciſion it ſelfe is called the ſigne, and chiefly the ſigne or ſeale of his being the father of all beleeuers, which was the firſt couuenant here made with him.

Objection.

So the lambe of the Paſſouer was called the Paſſeouer becauſe it did figure the paſſing ouer of the Angell.

Anſwer.

The Scripture in this place calls not expreſſely the Lambe the Paſſeour. *Ye ſhall gird your loines and put ſhooes on your feet, holding ſtaues in your handes, and ye ſhall eate haſtily for it is the Paſſeouer of our Lord*, the hebrew hath it the Paſſeouer to our Lord. which whether it be meant of

the lambe it ſelfe, or of the whole compliment of the ceremonies required, or of the lambe as eaten in that manner or order imports little, becauſe it makes nothing at all againſt vs. for we muſt obſerue that the word *paſcha* hath a double ſenſe: ſometimes it is taken properly and primarily for the reall paſſing of the Angell from one houſe to another through Egypt: at other times and that commonly improperly or figuratiuely for the ſolemnity or feaſt ordained on that day when he paſſed, and ſo yearely vppon the ſame in inſuing ages. Thus we take ordinarily the words Natiuity, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion of our Lord, either for his reall birth, riſing from the dead, or his aſcending into heauen; or for the ſolemnities of Chriſtmas, Eaſter or Aſcenſion: and to come to our purpoſe we take the word, *Corpus Chriſti*, the body of Chriſt either for his reall and true body, or for the feaſt in honour of his body called amongſt vs (*Corpus Chriſti*) ſo that vppon that day one might ſay: *Hic dies eſt corpus Chriſti.* this day is *Corpus Chriſti.*

Now the ſame was amongſt the Iewes, and inſtituted by Allmighty God in this place: ſo that by the word *Peſach* or Paſſeouer was vnderſtood not the reall paſſing ouer of the Angell, but the feaſt or Paſſeouer in honour of it, and ſo it is not called in hebrew (as I haue noted) the paſſing ouer of out Lord, but, to our

Lord;

Lord; that is in his honour for the great benefit repreſented in the feaſt of the Paſcha. Now if the Scripture had ſaid: This is that very Paſſeouer wherein our Lord killed ſo many thouſand Egyptians, and ſaued ſo many of our forefathers, as here is: *This is my Body which is braken for you. This is my blood which ſhall be ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſinnes*, whereby the words body and blood are determined to his reall body and blood. for noe figure or type of them was brooken or ſhed for our ſinnes: it might haue had ſome ſhew of parity. for then muſt the paſchall lambe needs haue been called the reall paſſage of the angell, and not the feſtiuityes nominated by the ſame word. Thus vppon *Corpus Chriſti* day one may ſay: This day is the body of our Lord; vnderſtanding by *Corpus Chriſti*, the ſolemnity ſo called as it is ordinarily vnderſtood: it might well paſſe. hut if one ſhould ſay vppon that day: *Hic dies eſt Corpus Chriſti quod pro nobis datum eſt: this day is the body of Chriſt which ſo many hunderd yeares a goe was giuen for our ſaluation.* all the world would condemne him noe leſſe of foolery then of falſhood and impiety. Though therefore the thing it ſelfe, and the picture, memoriall and ſolemnity of it may be called by the ſame name in a large or generall acception (thus the picture of Cæſar is called Cæſar, the ſolemnity of *Corpus Chriſti* is

called *Corpus Chriſti*) yet when there be certaine other particles and words adioyned which tye it to a ſignification of the thing it ſelfe, and diſtinguiſh it from the picture or memoriall of it, then the figure or memoriall can neuer be vnderſtood by that word accompanied with ſuch adiuncts: neither can the pourtraict or ſolemnity be euer ioyned with that word explicated with thoſe ſaid reſtrictiue particules. Thus though ſeeing the picture of the preſent King of Spaine, I can ſay: this is King Phillip the fourth: for that word ſignifies as wel King Phillip painted as really exiſting, yet I cannot ſay with truth if the word, *is*, be taken in its proper and ſubſtantiall ſignification which for the preſent is ſuppoſed I this is that King Phillip who liues now in Spaine, and whom this picture repreſents. neither can I ſay ſeeing the King himſelue: this is King Philip which ſtands in ſuch a chamber painted in the low countryes: for that is not the reall, but painted King, ſeeing therefore in the words of the inſtitution, that which our Sauiour gaue his Apoſtles is not only called his body which happily alone were indifferent to ſignifie his body painted or reall; ſubſtantiall or figuratiue naturall or myſticall: but addes this reſtrictiue (*which is giuen for you*) which particle can agree only with his reall body, the opponent will proue nothing

nothing at all against Roman Catholikes vnlesse there be produced out of Scripture some text where the word signifiing the thing it selfe, be applyed to the signe or figure with the same restrictiue and limiting particles, as proper to that thing it selfe; as here the word, *my Body*, is affirmed of the word, *this*, and declared to be that body which was giuen for vs, so that the words, *my Body which is broken or giuen for you*, can neuer be taken for any signe or figure of his true body for then a mere signe of his body should be broken for vs.

Obiection.

In the same sense, the arke the signe of the presence of God, is called God. for when the arke was brought into the camp, it is said, God is come into the camp.

Answer.

It is said so indeed but not by the Israëlites which were the faithfull people of God, but by the vnbeleeuing philistines who esteemed the Israëlites to haue an idoll for their God, as well as themselfes: *and the philistines feared much and said: God is come into the camp.* and by this argument the opponent may proue as well that it was a signe of many Gods, because the philistines called it Gods. *who woe vnto vs,* 1. King 4. v. 7. 1. King 4. v. 8.

ſaue vs from the hands of theſe high Gods? theſe are the Gods &c.

Objection.

So the rock is called Chriſt, becauſe it is a figure of Chriſt.

Anſwer.

1. Cor. 10. v. 4. The words are theſe: *They dranke of the ſpirituall rocke which followed them, but the rocke was Chriſt.* where ſeeing that the text ſpeaks expreſſely of a *ſpirituall rock* and ſayes that rocke was Chriſt, it ſpeakes not of any rocke which was a ſigne of Chriſt (for that muſt haue been a materiall viſible rocke) but of that which was Chriſt himſelfe: for he is truly a ſpirituall rocke without all ſignes and figures, as he is our ſpirituall phiſician, our good ſhepheard &c. and this ſpirituall rock only from which as the true ſupernaturall cauſe that water flowed, and which alone can truly be ſaid to haue followed the childeren of Iſrael in the deſert, was properly our Sauiour.

Obiection.

Gen. 41. v. 6. The ſeauen eares ares ſaid to be ſeauen yeares.

Anſwer.

Certaine it is that Pharao knew well enough that thoſe were not reall but imaginary eares framed

framed in his phantasie in time of his dreame, and so neuer intended to demand what they were in themselues, but what they portended, or what was signified by them, for it was the interpretation of his dreame which he sought for. and if Ioseph had answered him that these seauen eares were certaine representations which passed in his minde (as in themselues they truly were) he would haue deserued disgrace and punishment, rather then praise and reward: for Pharao knew that as well as he. Ioseph therefore answered according to Pharaos intention, that those seauen eares signified seauen yeares: and though in the English and Latin be the word (*are*) are seauen yeares *septem sunt anni:* yet the Hebrew according to the proprietie of that language, hath noe word expresly signifiing (*are*) which may (for any thing that can be conuinced from the Hebrew text) haue as well the verbe *signifie* or *represent* vnderstood as the verbe, *are*, *seauen eares*, *seauen yeares*, that is, *seauen eares* signifie or prefigure seauen yeares: so that standing close to the originall the argument proues nothing. yet though we should with the English translation vnderstand the words *are seauen yeares*, yet it would proue as little: for they were certaine Hieroglyphikes, emblemes, or characters defining or prescribing what was portended by the dreame. noe other- Gen. 41. v. 25.

wiſe then when one ſeeing a virgin painted with her eyes blinded and a paire of ſcales in her hand, ſhould aske, what is this? if one ſhould anſwer him that it is a picture drawne vppon a painted cloth, he would ſcarce haue patience with ſuch a folly or mockery: for he could not prudently be ſuppoſed to demand that which he ſaw with his eyes. but if it ſhould be anſwered that it is *inſtice*, he would preſently be ſatisfied. or if one who I know, could read Latin, and not vnderſtand it ſeeing this word, *domus*, ſhould aske me what it is, and I ſhould anſwer him that it is, *domus*, he might thinke I mocke him: but if I anſwered him that it is a houſe, he would take it for an anſwer. but if I knew he could not yet read, I might anſwer him that the word he asked me was, *domus*. thus according to the different circumſtances and reaſons that one hath to iudge that he who demandes, what this or that is, intends to know either what it is ſubſtantially in it ſelfe, or ſignificantly in reſpect of ſome other thing which it figures out vnto vs, the anſwer is to be framed, but yet with this caueat, that when the ſubiect of the demande is a thing abſolute of it ſelfe, and not a ſigne, figure, or embleme of another thing, then we are truly to anſwer what it is ſubſtantially in it ſelfe, vnleſſe it be cleare that the demanders intention be to know what in

ſome

ſome extraordinary caſe it ſignifies.but when the ſubiect in queſtion is it ſelfe a ſigne, figure,embleme or repreſentation of ſome other thing, it is to be anſwered what it ſignifies, vnleſſe it appeates euidently or very probably that the intention of the demand is to know not what it ſignifies,but what it is.

Thus when Pharao demanded what thoſe eares weare, they being only conceiued by him to be certaine preſages or tokens of ſomething elſe,noe man could in common ſenſe anſwer him but by telling him what was preſaged or intended by them. that is,what they were in that ſenſe in which he demanded, which anſwer could not be true in any other ſenſe then a figuratiue. for when Ioſeph gaue this anſwer that ſeauen eares were ſeauen yeares,had he vnderſtood it properly and ſubſtantially, it had concluded a formall contradiction and implication in the termes. For it is impoſſible that the thoughts of ones head which paſſe in an houre ſhould be truly and really one or many yeares.So the truth of holy Scripture and Ioſephs anſwer neceſſarily requiers a figuratiue ſenſe.and had our Sauiour ſaid as expreſſely, *this bread which you ſee is my body*,as Ioſeph ſaid *ſeauen eares are ſeauen yeares*, he ſhould haue beene vnderſtood to haue ſpoken for the ſame reaſon only in a figuratiue ſenſe. but ſeeing he neither ſayd, nor in-

tended to ſay any ſuch matter, but only, *This is my Body* &c. that is, this which I am now to giue you, and you receaue is my body (as I haue ſhewed) he muſt be ſuppoſed to affirme in a reall, proper and ſubſtantiall ſenſe without all ſignes or figures, that that which he was then about to giue them was his true body. for the word *this* both in it ſelfe and in thoſe circumſtances ſignifying a thing abſolute in it ſelfe and noe ſigne or figure, as the word *eare* doe in the place obiected, cannot be thought to haue any figuratiue ſignification: neither the word, *my body* (being expreſſed by that which followes, *which is ginen for you* to be his reall body) can be impropetly nor figuratiuely vnderſtood to ſignifye a ſigne, figure, remembrance or commemoration of his body for it was not a ſigne, figure and remembrance of his body, but his reall and true body which was giuen for vs. neither can there be any figure or impropriety in the word, *is*, as though it were nothing but *ſignifies or commemorates*: for ſeeing the ſubiect of the propoſition *this*, that is, which I am to giue, and the predicate, *my Body which is giuen for you*: properly vnderſtood, can be truly and really the one affirmed of the other thus: *This which I am to giue you, is really and ſubſtantially my body which is giuen for you*, according to the rules of all good interpreters it muſt be vnderſtood ſo as the opponent alſo

ackow-

acknowledged before. if therefore the opponent, or any other Protestant will proue any thing against vs in this particular, there must be produced some text of Scripture where a proposition (all things considered) can be verifyed in a reall and proper sense: as I haue proued this proposition: *This is my Body which is giuen for you*, can be, and yet is to be vnderstood figuratiuly and improperly. for so long as they produce ptopositions which cannot possibly be vnderstood in a reall and proper sense as this is which they haue cited: *seauen eares are seauen yeares*, and the like, there is a manifest disparity, because the former can very connaturally be vnderstood in a proper sense, and these not, and the fundamentall and vnanswerable reason is because the words of Scripture as also of all other authours, must be vnderstood properly when soeuer they can be vnderstood so, or when nothing compels vs to the contrary.

Obiection.

Euen before the fall of Adam there were two trees, the one whereof was called the tree of life, because it was a signe and memoriall to Adam that so long as he obeyed God, he should inioye life: the other of knowledge of good and euil, because it was a signe and memoriall vnto him, that if he obeyed God,

he ſhould know by experience the difference betweene good and euill.

Anſwer.

Theſe are only gloſſes and additions to Scripture contrary to what was before promiſed. where read you in the Bible that thoſe two trees were ſo called becauſe they were ſignes, the one of life, the other of knowledge of good and euill? if there be any ſuch place, why was it not cited in the margent? if noe ſuch, what can it be but gloſſing and adding to Scripture? & not only without, but againſt Scripture, in the very places cited, if we ſtand to the expreſſe words? for if the tree of life had been ſo called only becauſe it was a ſigne or memoriall to Adam that ſo long as he obeyed God he ſhould enioye life, as the objection affirmes, why then did God Allmighty prouide euen after his diſobedience that he ſhould not eate of the tree of life by putting a cherub in the way leaſt by eating he ſhould liue for euer?

Gen. 3. v. 23. 24.

Thus farre I haue anſwered the objections, and laid open the miſtakes which are extant in the paper: ſome others there are which are commonly objected and mainely ſtood vppon by our aduerſaries in this moſt weighty point of the reall preſence, leaſt therefore ſome might ſtik vppon them, as not being

yet

yet solued, I will propound distinctly some of the cheef of them obseruing the methode which I held before, of *objection* and *answer*.

Obiection.

What soeuer may be answered to any figure or signe in these wordes, *my body which is giuen for you*, as being so cleare and determinately signifying the reall body of Christ, yet why can there not be a figure in the word, *is*. which may be as much as, *signifies*, so that those words of our Sauiour *This is my Body*: may haue this sense: *this signifies my Body*?

Answer.

I haue in effect already satisfyed this difficulty, or at least giuen sufficient grounds to satisfye it. for the word, *is*, is neuer to be drawn from its ordinary and proper signification when it can with all conueniency retaine it, as I haue iust now demonstrated, it may here, beside that which is more cleere and known, cannot prudently be signifyed by that which is more obscure and remote from our knowledge, now the body of Christ visibly present before the eyes of the Apostles was more cleerely known to them then the significant figure of the bread, and so could not be signifyed without absurditie by the bread in time of the first institution of this Sacrament, as if

I show

I show my naked hand to any one, it were absurd to hold vp my gloue to signifie that my hand is there.

Further, had the bread then barely signifyed the body of Christ as presently after to suffer, it would haue been a bare type and figure of his passion, as was the Paschall Lamb, and so a shaddow of things to come, proper to the old law, and consequently would not haue been a Sacrament of the law of grace, as certainly, according to all, it was.

Objection.

Ioan. 6. When the Iews thought that our Sauiour would giue them his true flesh to eate, he corrected theyr errour and tould them, *it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the words which I speake vnto you, are spirit and life*, therefore our Sauiour giues vs not his reall flesh to eate.

Answer.

Sayes our Sauiour here *my flesh* profiteth nothing? where find you that? noe, replies the protestant, but he sayes, that *the flesh profiteth nothing*, and seeing he had spoken much before of his own flesh, what can he be thought to meane by *the flesh*, but his own? and can any Christian thinke that he meant his own, vnlesse he denie that he is redeemed by the tor-

ſorments, and death of Chriſt, or eſteeme his redemption noe profit: or dare a Chriſtian entertaine ſo baſe an opinion of Chriſts moſt ſacred and diuine fleſh, as to thinke that it is in oppoſition to the Spirit of God, as the fleſh here mentioned, is affirmed to be by our Sauiour, *it is the ſpirit that quickneth, the fleſh profiteth nothing*: or where through the whole Bible ſhall they finde, *fleſh contradiſtinct from ſpirit*, as here they are, wherby is not meant, our corrupt nature, our fleſhly immaginations, our low and naturall diſcourſes, ignorance, malice, &c. and muſt it only here ſignify the fleſh of Chriſt? is not this *Scripture miſtaken!* it is therefore of the Iews carnall and groſſe vnderſtanding whereof he ſpeakes, which was wholy oppoſite to the true ſpirit, light, and life of God, which made them immagine that our Sauiour would cut out peeces of fleſh from his body and giue it them to eate, or permit himſelfe to be viſibly cut and quartered, as meat is at the ſhambles, and ſo roſted, and eaten by them, as S. Auguſtine obſerues in this place, which naturall, and carnall diſcours our Sauiour affirmes to profit nothing, and not his own moſt pure and heauenly fleſh vnderſtood aright only by true faith, which he calls here the Spirit, or ſpirituall light. it will be ſaid, that we affirming that our Sauiours fleſh is truly eaten by vs though not in ſo groſſe a ma-

a maner, are no leſſe condemned by our Sauiour, for our carnall vnderſtanding of this miſtery, then were the Capernaites. I anſwer, that there is as much difference betwixt vs in this particular, as there was betwixt S. Ioſeph and Herod, about our Sauiours natiuity, for though both of them vnderſtood that he had true fleſh, and was borne of a woeman, yet Herod imagined that he was conceiued and borne in the ordinary maner of other childrē, that he was a mere man, &c. and was holy ignorant both of his mothers virginity, and that his humaine ſoul and body were vnited to the diuine perſon. Thus the Capernaites hauing no more knowledge of his diuinity then Herod had, thought that his fleſh was to be eaten after the ſame ordinary maner that other meates vſe to be eaten, merely to feed the body, and went noe farther. But all true Catholiques beleeue, that his ſacred fleſh is liuing, and vnited to the diuine perſone, and eaten by vs, though truly, and really as he was truly and really borne, yet after a moſt pure, heauenly, and in effable manner as he was brought into this world, wherby his bleſſed fleſh cōſidered abſolutely in it ſelfe is neyther rent, nor torne, nor deuided, nor conſumed, but remaines as whole, perfect and intire, after he is eaten by vs as it was before, as the Apoſtle S. Andrew ſais. In this maner, though

our

our Sauiour spoake of his reall flesh, yet were his words Spirit and Life, noe lesse then these words of S. Iohn, *the word was made flesh*, and a thousand such like are, though they speake of the true flesh of our Sauiour: because his very flesh it selfe by reason of its vnion to the diuine person, and glorious proprieties wholy deifyed, and spiritualizd, in such sort that receiuing it we receiue a *Spirituall body*, though true and reall; Here the earnest Reformer will tell mee that I speake contradictions, for it is as vnpossible that a body should be spirituall, as a Spirit corporall, I answer. If I speake cõtradictions, I haue learned them out of the Protestant Bible, and common prayer booke; where S. Paul sayes of a body after the resurrection, it is sown a naturall body it rises a *Spirituall body*. And yet this wonder full body of Christ, exists in the Sacrament much more like a spirit, then doth any other glorious body according to ordinary prouidence; viz, whole in the whole host, and whole in euery part of it, as the soul exists in the body, an Angel in the place he possesses, and God in the world. And as this admirable body, hath the proprieties of a Spirit, so hath it the properties of life, being liuing bread, and giuing life eternall to those who worthily receiue it, as our Sauiour pronounces of it, and according to S. Iohn, *what was made in him was life*; diuinity, and

Ioan. 1.

Ioan. 1.

and humanity, and soul, and body, and flesh, and blood in him are all life, soe great reason had our Saviour to say, speaking of them, *the words which I have spoaken to you are spirit, and life.*

These are the cheefe arguments against the reall presence which Protestants vse to draw from Scripture; others there are fittet for heathens, then Christians, which they draw from naturall reason, where to though I be not oblidged to answer, in this treatis, yet because I am exceedingly desirous to giue all the satisfaction I am able to euery one; I will breefly set the cheefe of them down, and as breefly answer them, but because I suppose for the present that I dispute against such as make profession to be Christians, I esteeme my selfe to haue giuen a sufficient satisfaction to theyr difficulties, if I giue them cleare instances in some article of Christian faith which they beleeue, wherein they must solue the like difficulty, to that which they vrge from naturall reason against this mystery.

Objection.

How can accidents exist without a substance, as here they must doe?

Answer.

How can a humane nature subsist without its propet personality, as in the Incarnation of Christ it must doe? vnlesse Protestants with Nesto-

Nestorius will grant that in Christ be two Persons.

Objection.

How can one and the same body be in many places at the same time, as they must be if the reall presence be true.

Answer.

How can one and the same soul, Angel, and God be in many places at the same tyme, which they must be if theyr spirituality, and Gods vbiquity be true.

Objection.

How can the parts of our Sauiours body so penetrate one an other that the whole body may be conteyned in the least part of the host, or drop of the chalice?

Answer.

How can the body of our Sauiour penetrate the dore and passe through his mothers wombe, when they both remayned shut?

Objection.

How should the body of our Sauiour in the consecrated host be distinguished from others, when it is put amongst them?

Answer.

How should a drop of our Sauiours blood be distinguished from the blood of other

men, if in tyme of his paſſion it had been mixed with them?

Objection.

If our Sauiours fleſh and blood be really preſent in the Sacrament, then cats and Rats may eate them?

Anſwer.

If our Sauiors fleſh and blood were truly in the paſſion, particles of *his* ſacred fleſh being rent of, and drops of his blood ſhed here and there, then dogs and cats might haue as well eaten them,

Objection.

How is it poſſible that the whol bulke of a mans body ſhould be ſo light, that a fly ſhould be able to crary it?

Anſwer.

How ſhould the whole bulke of a mans body be ſo light, that it ſhould mount vp like a flame of fyer, into heauen? as our Sauiours did in his aſcenſion?

Objection.

If there be ſo many miracles, as you muſt hold wrought by our Sauiour, in the reall preſence, why were none of them ſeene, as the other mitacles of Chriſt were?

Anſwer.

If there were ſo many miracles wrought in the Incarnation of our Sauiour as you muſt hold,

hold, why were none of them ſeene, as the other miracles of Chriſt were?

Objection.

How can we poſſibly conceiue a body with out any extention of parts, or locall forme and figure?

Anſwer.

How can wee poſſibly conceiue a humaine nature ſubſiſting without a humaine perſonality?

Objection.

What difference will there be betwixt a body without all extention, and locall figure, and a ſpirit?

Anſwer.

What difference will there be betwixt the ſoul of a new borne infant and that of a brute beaſt, which cannot actually vnderſtand? the one hath a power to vnderſtand, will you ſay, and not the other; the one hath a power to be extended, and haue a locall figure, ſay I, and not the other.

Objection.

If our Sauiours body be truly in the Sacrament, then all wicked perſons, and greeuous ſinners who frequent it, receiue his true body into theyr mouthes, and breſts.

Anſwer.

If our Sauiours body was truly in the wilderneſſe, then the Diuel receiued it into his armes and carryed it to the pinnacle of the temple, and if it were a true body in tyme of his Paſſion, then Iudas the traitour kiſſed it, the hard harted Iewes, and Barbarous ſouldiers tutcht it, abuſed it, ſcorgd it, crucified it, and troad his moſt pretious blood vnder their feete, is not this as much diſgracefull to his body, and blood, as now to be receiued into ſinners mouthes?

Objection.

If there be nothing viſible or ſenſible but ſpecies, accidents and formes of bread, in the Sacrament, how ſhall wormes be generated from the hoaſt corrupted, or putrifyed, ſeeing they muſt conſiſt of matter and forme, and ſo be produced of ſome materiall ſubſtance.

Anſwer.

If there were nothing but humaine nature in Chriſt as man, without humaine perſonality, how could it performe the actions of a perſon, ſeeing all other actions of men proceed from theyr perſons, and not from theyr natures, as the compleate principle of them. You will ſay, the diuine perſonality ſupplyed the place of humaine perſonality in Chriſt, and I

ſay

say that diuine power supplies the place of nature in this Sacrament, in producing a matter, after the species of bread be corrupted, and the body of our Sauiour ceases to be vnder them.

Obiection.

But how can an accident performe the office of a substance?

Answer.

But how can the personality of one person performe the office of the personality of an other?

Obiection.

God vnited the diuine personality to humane nature, and so it subsists by it, as supplying the want of its own.

Answer.

God vnites a matter produced at the exigency of nature, to the accidents which were of bread, which in the production of wormes from a putrifyed hoast supplyes the want of theyr own.

These, to my best remembrance, are the cheefe difficulties, which according to the principles, of naturall reason, our Aduersaries commonly presse against vs in this mistery, in answer wherof, I haue playnly

shewed, that they themselues must answer as great or greater difficultyes, which may be opposed by heathens, and Infidells against other articles of our faith which they beleeue, let them therefore eyther desist to moue any such heathnish objections as these, against the reall presence, or acknowledge that whilst they presse these against it, they giue iust occasion to an Infidell to presse the like against themselues: which when they haue solued in other mysteries, they will haue solu'd their own, against this.

Before I end this controuersie, I will summe vp briefly what I haue said at large in this treatis, that the Reader may haue a full sight of it at one View. first, I haue (according to my former methode) cited the doctrine of the Concil of Trent. whence clearly appeares that it conteynes nothing, grosse and Capernaiticall (as Protestants commonly are made beleeue) but a most heauenly, pure, mysticall, liuing, and ineffable presence. Secondly I haue cited the words of the Euangelists and S. Paul touching the Institution, which are not only most clere in themselues (as I haue proued) but are iudged soe to be both by Martin Luther, in his first Tome printed at Iena, an. 1589. Concione 3. de Confessione, & Sacramento Eucharistiæ, parte 2. pag. 329. where after he had cited the words of the Euangelists, he said

ſaith thus: Hæc ſunt verba quæ neque ipſi, neque etiam Sathan negare poterit, in quæ figendus pes eſt, vt firmiter in iis conſiſtamus. Sunt autem nuda & planiſſima, quæ nullis interpretationibus eludi poſſunt. Quòd & panis ſit Chriſti corpus. pro nobis traditum, & calix Chriſti ſanguis, pro nobis effuſus, & iubemur illa facere in commemoratione ipſius.

Theſe are words, which neyther they (he meanes Romane Catholicques) nor Sathan can denie, vppon which wee are to fix our foote, that we may ſtand immouuable in them. For they are naked and moſt plaine which cannot be ſhifted of by any Interpretations. That bread is the body of Chriſt, which is giuen for vs, and the cup the blood of Chriſt, which is ſhed for vs, and that we are commanded to doe them in remembrance of him. Thus Luther. which though he here affirmes, to proue his errours, of Conſubſtantiation, and Communion in both kindes againſt vs, yet withall he clearely, confeſſes that the words are moſt plaine for the reall preſence of Chriſts true body, and blood in this holy Sacrament, which he allwayes held.

Theſe texts alſo are ſo vndeniably clere, for the reall Preſence, that Zuinglius the firſt authour of the Sacramentaries changed the word in all the Euangeliſts, and S. Paul ἐστι in Greeke, *eſt* in Latin, in theſe words, *This is my*

Body, this is my blood, into significat, thus, *this signifies* my body, *this signifies* my blood, and so printed them in his Bible, dedicated to Francis King of France, and printed at Tiguris anno 1525. as witnesses Conradus Scluslenburgh a learned Protestant, in Theologiâ Caluinistarum le. 2. ar. 3. fol. 43. And Zuinglius himselfe approuues of this his translation to. 2. de verâ & falsâ religione c. 5. fol. 210.

And Beza. Translating, those words of S. Luke, *qui pro vobis effunditur: which is powred out for you*, puts, them thus in greeke, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, &c. τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. *Hoc poculum quod pro vobis effunditur, this chalice which is powred out for you*, and in his Latin translation he puts them thus, *hoc poculum* &c. *in sanguine meo, qui pro vobis effunditur, which blood is powred out for you*, referring the word *this*, to blood and not to chalice, quite contrary to the Greeke construction, which not withstanding he confesses to haue found, in all the ancient Greeke copies which he had read, and hauing noe other shift to auoyd the force of these words as they stand in all these Greeke copies acknowledging that they make quite against him, he is put to that desperate insolensie, as to say, that these words, *which* (chalice) *is powred out for you*, haue crept out of the margent into the text, by negligẽce of writers, and soe are not the word of God. soe Bezaes

transl-

tranſlation Greeke, and Latin, printed, by Henry Steenen, anno 1565. Thirdly, I haue diſcouered clerely the ſundry groſſe miſtakes of Scripture, in the words, *it, take, eate this, doe this in remembrance*, &c. Fourtly, I haue ſhewed the miſtakes, in the parities brought, of I am a dore, a vine, a way, &c. Fiftly, I haue layd open the miſtakes, in the inſtances, of other Sacraments, and figuratiue ſpeeches alleadged by the opponent in the old Teſtament, and many ſuch like miſapplications.

The maine things where in I ſtand are, that the words of S. Luke are ſoe clere, that Beza hath noe way to auoyd the force of them, then by ſaing that they crept out of the Margent into the text, though he confeſſes to haue found them, as he cites them, in all the Greeke Copies which he had ſeene.

And ſecondly, that ſeeing theſe words, *This is my Body which is giuen for you*, may moſt eaſily and connaturally be vnderſtood in a moſt proper ſenſe, without violating any other article of our faith, or plaine place of holy Scripture, that they muſt be ſoe vnderſtood, onleſſe wee will take away all force from Scripture to proue any thing, and deſtroy the fundamētall rule not only of Interpretation of Scripture, but of all humaine conuerſation, which is, that euery one is, ſo be vnderſtood to ſpeake properly, when nothing conſtraynes to the con-

contrary, ſeeing therefore, I haue clearly demonſtrated, that in the inſtãces alleadged none of the figuratiue ſpeeches, can be vnderſtood in a proper ſenſe, without the violation of ſome article of our faith, proceeding according to true diſcours, euen confeſſed by our aduerſarios, I conuince alſo that they haue no force to proue, that theſe ſacramentall words are to be vnderſtood figuratiuely.



THE

THE SEAVENTH CONTROVERSIE

Concerning Communion vnder one kinde.

The Doctrine of the Church of Rome, deliuered in the Council of Trent.

Seſſ.13.cap.3.

SEmper hæc fides in Eccleſiâ Dei fuit. Statim poſt conſecrationem verum Domini noſtri corpus, verumque eius ſanguinem ſub panis & vini ſpecie vna cum ipſius animâ & diuinitate exiſtere; ſed corpus quidem ſub ſpecie panis, & ſanguinem ſub vini ſpecie ex vi verborum: ipſum corpus ſub ſpecie vini, & ſanguinem ſub ſpecie panis, animamque ſub vtraque vi naturalis illius connexionis,& concomitantiæ, quâ partes Chriſti Domini, qui iam ex mortuis reſurrexit,non ampliùs moriturus,inter ſe copulantur: Diuinitatem porrò propter admirabilem illam eius cum corpore & animâ hypoſtaticam vnio-

vnionem. Quapropter veriſſimum eſt tantumdem ſub altetutrâ ſpecie, atque ſub vtrâque contineri, totus enim & integer Chriſtus, ſub panis ſpecie, & ſub quauis ipſius ſpeciei parte, totus item ſub vini ſpecie, & ſub eius partibus exiſtit.

This faith hath been alwayes in the church of God, that preſently after conſecration the true body and blood of Chriſt did exiſt vnder the ſpecies of bread, and wine, togeather with his ſoul and diuinity. But his body vnder the ſpecies of bread, and his blood vnder the ſpecies of wine, by force of the words: but his body vnder the ſpecies of *wine*, and his blood vndet the ſpecies of bread, and his ſoul vndet both, by force of that naturall connexion, and concomitancy, whereby the parts of Chriſt our Lord, who is now riſen from the dead, not to dy any more, are ioyned togeathet, moreouer alſo his diuinity both with his body and ſoul by reaſon of that admirable hypoſtaticall vnion with them. wherefore it is moſt true, that as much is conteyned vnder eythet kinde, as vnder both togeather. for whol and intire Chriſt exiſts vnder the *ſpecies or kinde* of bread, and each part of it, and whol Chriſt exiſts vnder the ſpecies of wine, and vnder each part of it. The ſame doctriue is confirmed. ſeſſ. 13. can. 3.

Item

Item seſſ. 21. cap. 3.

Inſuper declarat quamuis Redemptor noſter, vt anteà dictum eſt, in ſupremâ illâ cœnâ hoc Sacramentum in duabus ſpeciebus inſtituerit, & Apoſtolis tradiderit, tamen fatendum eſſe, etiam ſub alterâ tantùm ſpecie *totum atque integrum Chriſtum, verumq́; Sacramentum ſumi*, ac propterea quod ad fructum attinet, nulla gratia, neceſſariâ ad ſalutem, eos defraudari, qui vnam ſpeciem ſolam accipiunt.

Moreouer (*the Council*) declares, that although our Redeemer, as is aboue ſaid, inſtituted this Sacrament in his laſt ſupper vnder both kindes, yet it is to be confeſſed, that vnder one only kinde *whol Chriſt, and a true Sacrament is receiued*; and therefore, for ſoe much as belongs to the fruict, that thoſe who receiue it only vnder one kinde, are not defrauded of any grace, neceſſary to ſaluation.

Ibidem cap. 2.

Prætereà declarat, hanc poteſtatem pepetuò in Eccleſiâ fuiſſe, vt in Sacramentorum diſpenſatione, ſaluâ illorum ſubſtantiâ, ea ſtatueret vel mutaret, quæ ſuſcipientium vtilitati, ſeu ipſorum Sacramentorum venerationi, pro rerum, temporum, ac locorum varietate, magis expedire iudicaret. Id autem Apoſtolus non obſcurè viſus eſt inuiſſe, cùm ait: *Sic nos exiſtimet* 1. Cor. 4. 1. Cor. 4.

met homo, vt miniſtros Chriſti, & diſpenſatores my-
ſteriorum Dei, atque quidem hac poteſtate vſum eſſe, ſatis conſtat, cùm in multis aliis, tum in hoc ipſo Sacramento, cum ordinatis nonnullis circa eius vſum, cætera inquit, cùm venero diſponam. Quare agnoſcens ſancta mater Eccleſia hanc ſuam in adminiſtratione Sacramentorum authoritatem, licèt ab initio Chriſtianæ Religionis, non infrequens vtriuſque ſpeciei vſus fuiſſet; tamen progreſſu temporis, latiſſimè iam mutatâ illâ conſuetudine grauibus & iuſtis de cauſis adducta, hanc conſuetudinem ſub alterâ ſpecie communicandi, approbauit, & pro lege habendam decreuit, quam reprobare aut ſine ipſius Eccleſiæ authoritate pro libito mutare non licèt.

Further (the Coūcil) declares, that this power hath allwayes been in the church, that in the diſpenſation of the Sacraments, the ſubſtance being kept inuiolated and intire, ſhe might appoint and change, ſuch things, as, ſhe iudged to be expedient for the profit of the receiuers, or the veneration of the Sacraments, according to the variety of things, times, and places. And this the Apoſtle ſeemes not obſcurely to haue inſinuated, when he ſayes: *Let a man ſoe eſteeme vs, as Miniſters of Chriſt, and diſpsnſers of the myſteries of God*, and that he made vſe of this power is clere enough, both in many other things, and particularly, in this Sacrament,

1. Cor. 4.
1. Cor. 6.

when,

when ordayning ſome things concerning the vſe of this Sacrament, he ſaid, I will diſpoſe the reſt when I come. wherefore our holy mother the church taking notice of this her power in the adminiſtration of Sacraments, though in the beginning of the church the vſe of both kindes was frequent. yet in proceſſe of time that cuſtome being now notably changed, being induced by iuſt, and important reaſons, ſhe hath approuued this cuſtome of communicating vnder one kinde, and hath decreed that it be held for a law, which it is not lawfull to change, or reproue at ones pleaſure without the authority of the church. The like doctrine is deliuered, in the firſt chap. of this ſeſſion.

From theſe texts it is maniſeſt, that the Council, was induced to command this practice, firſt becauſe whol Chriſt is vnder both kindes, 2. becauſe in each kinde is the whole eſſence, and ſubſtance of this Sacrament, 3. becauſe noe ſacramentall grace neceſſary to ſalvation, is loſt by communicating vnder one kinde. 4. becauſe many important reaſons toutching the honour and reſpect dew to ſoe diuine a Sacramēt, mouued her to it. 5. becauſe there is noe diuine command to the contrary, as appearrs ſeſſ. 21. cap. 1. 6 becauſe the church hath power to diſpence the Sacraments as ſhe finds moſt cōuenient, ſoe long, as

Gods commands, and theyr ſubſtance are not violated. 7. That it is not in any ones power, ſaue only of the church to change this coſtome.

The Proteſtant Poſition.

Deliuered in the 39. Articles of the Engliſh Church. Art. 30.

THe cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people. For both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Chriſts ordenance, ought to be miniſtred to all Chriſtian men alike.

This is proued by Scripture miſtaken, as will preſently appeare.

Hauing therefore, as I hope, cleared this point of the reall preſence in the iuſt balance of an open and impartiall eye, it will not be very difficult to euen an other as a ſequell from this concerning communion vnder one kind, which though it be not thought vppon in theſe objections, yet this fit occaſion, the great difficulties which our aduerſaries raiſe againſt it, the earneſt deſire which many not otherwiſe ill diſpoſed, haue to be ſatisfied in it, and the requeſt of others who haue ſeene ſome part of this treatis haue put me vppon a ne-

neceſſitie to ſay ſomething but very ſuccinctly of this matter holding my ſelfe cloſe to Scripture according to my former methode.

This point therefore ſuppoſes the reall preſence, and is rather to be treated againſt Lutherans, or ſuch other Proteſtants as are conuinced of that myſterie then againſt Caluiniſts or Suinglians who diſbeleeue it, for were not our Sauiours body and blood really preſent there, as the practiſe of receauing one only kind had neuer been allowed, ſo could it not haue been defended. This therefore ſuppoſed, I will indeauour to defend communion vnder one kind, and anſwer whatſoeuer is preſſed by our aduerſaries againſt it out of Scripture miſtaken.

Objection.

Firſt they vrge the inſtitution of this Sacrament as hauing been vnder the formes both of bread and wine, which inſtitution is to be followed by all Chriſtians and ſo both to be receaued.

Anſwer.

The bare inſtitution of a Sacrament drawes with it noe neceſſitie of frequenting it, as appeares in Prieſthood and mariage inſtituted

by our Sauiour. which not withſtanding impoſe noe neceſſitie or command to receaue them, ſo that ſtanding preciſely in the inſtitution, noe man wil be obliged to receaue either both, or either of them.

Objection.

Secondly though the bare inſtitution of a Sacrament impoſe noe command to receaue it, yet it imports a precept that when it is receaued or adminiſtred, it be done in that manner it was inſtituted, as it appeares in baptiſme, Prieſthood and other Sacraments. Seeing therefore our Sauiour inſtituted this Sacrament both in the conſecration and communion in both kinds, at leaſt whenſoeuer it is receaued, it muſt be receaued vnder both.

Anſwer.

This objection inuolues many difficulties and is firſt to be vndeerſtood that Sacraments are to be receaued and adminiſtred as they were firſt inſtituted in ſuch matters as belong to the ſubſtance and eſſence of the Sacrament, not in other accidentary circumſtances of time, place, perſonnes, precedences, conſequences, &c. as was the inſtitution of this Sacrament after ſupper, ſitting vppon the ground, giuen to prieſts only, in a priuate ſecular houſe &c.

Secondly

Secondly there is ſomething particular in this Sacrament which is in noe other, euen concerning the ſubſtance of it: for the very ſame entire ſubſtance being here put vnder each kind makes that woeſoeuer receaues either of them, receaues the whole ſubſtance of this Sacrament and conſequently receaues a true Sacrament inſtituted by our Sauiour; and ſo that which is able to ſanctifie him who worthily receaues either of them.

Thirdly concerning the ſubſtance of this Sacrament all that can be gathered from the bare words of the inſtitution, is that it is to be conſecrated and receiued by Prieſts ſuch as were the Apoſtles who were Prieſts, then made when it was firſt inſtituted vnder both kinds, but here is noe preſident giuen about the lay people, becauſe none then receaued it. That the whole ſubſtance of our Sauiour is here receaued I ſuppoſe for the preſent, neither is it much queſtioned by ſuch as grant the reall preſence, nor can be poſſibly doubted of by any who beleeues that our Saoiour dies noe more, and ſoe both fleſh and blood, and life, and ſoule, and diuinitie are all vnited togeather wereſoeuer he is: hence therefore followes that lay people receiue as much of our Sauiour (ſeeing they receaue him wholy and interily) as Prieſts doe.

That he who receaues our Sauiour thus

vnder one only kind receaues a true Sacrament is as cleare as the former for who can without abſurditie denye that vnder one kind is exhibited *an outward viſible ſigne of an inward ſpirituall grace*, which is the compleat definition of a Sacrament according to our aduerſaries: for here the formes of bread only containing vnder them our Sauiour by way of meat, ſignifie that he confers a ſpirituall grace nouriſhing and feeding our ſoules to eternall life and thus much is ſignified by the Engliſh miniſters when they diſtribute the bread to the people ſaying: *the Body of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt preſerue thy body and ſoul to eternall life*, &c. and containing his body repreſented as ſeparated from his blood, and ſo as dead by force of the words of conſecration are an outward viſible commemoratiue ſigne of his ſacred death and paſſion. and ſeeing that both bread is compoſed of many graines, and wine of many grapes vnited togeather, the myſtical vnity of Chriſtians receauing this Sacrament is ſufficiently ſignified hy the ſpecies of either of them. if then here he *an outward viſible ſigne of an inward ſpirituall grace* both exhibitiue, commemoratiue and ſignificatiue, here muſt needs be a true Sacrament euen according to the pttnciples of our aduerſaries. and what I haue ſaid of the forme of bread, is by the ſame reaſon verified of the forme of wine. but not only

only in their principles, but in all good Theologie there muſt be a true Sacrament vnder each kind: for certainly ſeeing that a different grace is conferred by each of them, the one of ſpirituall meate, the other of ſpirituall drinke (which how it is to be vnderſtood, I will hereafter examine) each will be ſufficient to ſanctifie and helpe the ſoul to eternall life. If it ſhould be replyed that in neither of theſe kinds alone is exhibited a compleate ſigne either of our ſpirituall refection, or the death of our Sauiour but only a partiall or imparfect ſigne of them, which notwithſtanding are compleatly ſignificd vnder both togeather. I anſwer that if by a compleat ſigne be vnderſtood a moſt full and expreſſe repreſentation of theſe two particulars, I grant that there is not vnder one only kind ſo full and expreſſe a repreſentation (and in this ſenſe not ſo compleat a ſigne of them) as vnder both togeather. but then it muſt be prouued (this moſt full and expreſſe repreſentation vnder both being exhibited to lay Chriſtians by the conſecration and communion of the Prieſt in the dread full ſacrifice of the maſſe) that the ſubſtance of this ſacrifice requirs that they ſhould be allways ſo fully and expreſſely repreſented in each particular communion of the people. but if by a compleat ſigne be vnderſtood a ſigne ſufficient to ſignifie both our

ſpirituall food and vnion, and the death of our Sauiour, I denie that there is not a compleat ſigne of both exhibited vnder each kind. This diſtinction may be much illuſtrated by an inſtance from baptiſme, certainly the myſtery of the trinity was more expreſſely, fully and compleatly ſignified by that ancient couſtome of a threefold dipping the child in the water, and the words of baptiſme then by the ſame words and putting water once vppon the child, and yet this latter is iudged ſufficient euen by Proteſtants. for who can doubt that the formes of bread ſufficiently giue vs to vnderſtand that our Sauiours is the food of our ſoules noe leſſe then the bread of propoſition in the old, and the bread multiplied by our Sauiour in the new Teſtament; and his calling himſelfe the bread of life in the ſixt of S. Iohn prefigured and ſignified ſufficiently that our Sauiour was to be the bread of our ſoules: and who ſeeing a body ly before him void of ſoul and blood as our Sauiour is here repreſented by force of the words, gathers not preſently that it is dead though he ſee not the blood which iſſued from it: and the ſame is of the blood of our Sauiour vnder the forme of wine, for this alone is noe leſſe ſufficient to repreſent the death of our Sauiour then was the blood alone of the paſchall lambe ſprinkled vppon the poſts of

the

the Iſraëlites by the Iewiſh prieſts to prefigurate the ſhedding of his precious blood and ſacred paſſion: nor is the blood of our Sauiour vnder the forme of wine leſſe ſufficient to repreſent the ſpirituall exhiberation and conforting of our ſoules thē was the wine in Cana of Galilee, and that ſentence ſpoken of by the Prophete (wine producing virgins) able to forefigurate the ſame blood ſo comforting: as alſo the ſpecies of bread or wine alone to ſignifie the vnity and amitie which is to be amongſt Chriſtians both in regard of Chriſt and themſelues, as I haue ſhewed. Hence therefore appeares that ſeeing in each kinde apart both the death of our Sauiour, and our ſpirituall meate and drinke and vnion reſpectiuely are ſufficiently ſignifieds each muſt neceſſarily containe a true Sacrament, and not only the part of a true Sacrament: and ſeeing in each a true Sacrament is receaued, each alone muſt conferre that grace which is ſignified by it, and ſo ſanctifie the ſoul of ſuch as receaue it, and conſequently may be receaued fruitfully and ſauingly alone for ſo much as belongs to the bare inſtitution: for if our Sauiour inſtituted each ſpecies apart to conferre ſauing grace, then who receaues either deuoutly receaues that grace for which our Sauiour inſtituted it, and ſo we are put in the ſtate of ſaluation by receauing one vnleſſe

thete be some other command produced which obligeth all to receaue both, which shall here after be examined.

Objection.

Some may happily obiect that this answer subsists not, for according to this doctrine the Priest also receaues a true Sacrament and the spirituall graces and fruits of it when he receaues the host only, and yet euen after he hath receaued the host; he is obliged to receaue the chalice according to Roman Catholiques, therefore though it should be granted that lay people by receauing vnder the species of bread only, receaue a true Sacrament with the sauing grace signified and conferred by it, yet they may be obliged to receaue the other kind as Priests are.

Answer.

There is first a great difference betwixt the Apostles and lay Christians, for they were directly and expressely obliged by our Sauiour in time of the institution to receaue the chalice euen after they had receaued the true Sacrament and the grace of it vnder the species of bread. whence may probably be gathered that all Priests consecrating haue the same obligation of receauing both: but noe such command was directly and expesse-

ly

y giuen to lay people none hauing been here. Secondly Prieſts conſecrating and ſacrificing are obliged to receaue of each part of theyr ſacrifice, and ſo though preciſely ſtanding in the eſſence of a Sacrament, there be no diuine obligation, yet in regard of conſummating and participating of theyr own ſacrifice they are bound to receaue both as the Apoſtles did, wich hath noe place in lay people. The anſwer only concluds that ſtanding preciſely in the inſtitution, ſeeing lay people receaue vnder one kind a true Sacrament with ſauing grace, it cannot be thence conninced that they are bound to receaue more; ſo that if there be any obligation of receauing both it muſt riſe from ſome other head and not from the bare inſtitution, whereof we treate in anſwer to this objection now taken from it alone.

Obiection.

It may be yet further obiected that our Sauiour here inſtituted a full and compleat refection not only by way of meate, or by way of drinke only, but of both togeather, and therefore ſuch as receaue one only kind receaue but one part of this heauenly banquet and want the other, which ſeemeth quite contrary to the inſtitution and intention of our Sauiour.

Anſwer.

Anſwer,

Our Sauiour inſtituted this celeſtiall banquet in ſo ineffable a manner that the very ſame ſubſtantiall thing was to be both our meat and drinke, to wit, himſelfe and that ſo abundantly that either both to geather, or each a part are ſo ſuffizing a repaſt, that they communicate ſtrengh and life to all ſuch as worthily receaue them: and though both being receaued make but one compleat refection by reaſon they are both taken at once by way of meate and drinke, as it happens in other ordinary refections, yet each of them receaued apart, or at different times, is alſo a full and compleat refection of the ſoul by reaſon that each communicates ſauing grace ſufficient to ſaluation, and this euidently appeares in common feaſts and banquets, for when many diſhes are eaten and different ſortes of wine drunke at the ſame time or meeting, they are eſteemed but one meal or banquet, and yet if at different times one ſhould feed now vppon one, then vppon another of theſe diſhes apart, or dranke but one ſorte of wine one day, and an other of them an other, then ſuch eating and drinking by reaſon of the diuerſitie of times would be counted diuers ſufficient refections: and if it were poſſible to find in other meates and

drinke

drinke what is found in this Sacrament, that as well the one the other alone could preſerue and conferre life, and that one could liue with drinking without eating, or eating without drinking, then either of theſe a part would become a full refection all therefore that can be gathered from this objection is only that our Sauiour in the firſt inſtitution gaue a moſt plentifull and abundant banquet, whereof each part in it ſelfe was ſufficient to conferre life and ſatieté to his Apoſtles, which in ſucceeding ages being receaued either ioyntly, or apart, was to be a ſufficient refection for Chriſtians. But from the inſtitution vnder both kindes followed not (which is cheeſly preſſed in this objection) that our Sauiours intention was that theſe two kindes ſhould be ſuch parts of this heauenly feaſt that both of them are eſſentially required to it, for then he would not haue giuen each of them force to conferre grace ſufficient for ſaluation, but would haue had that grace neceſſarily dependant vppon the receauing of both togeather. Now that the receauing of our Sauiour vnder the forme of bread only conferres life and ſaluation is out of all queſtion Ioan. 6. *He who eateth this bread ſhall liue for euer*, and that perfectly and entirely as appeareth by theſe words: *As I liue by my father ſo he who eateth me ſhall liue by me.* for our Sauiour

viour liueth by his father not partially, bu wholy and perfectly.

Obiection.

Further one may reply that as corporal meate and drinke haue different effects, the one of nourishing and strengthing the othe of comforting and exhilerating, so proportionably this diuine meate and drinke mus haue the like different spirituall effects correspondent to each of them. whence followeth that he who receaues one only, is deprived of the grace corresponding to the other, and so the people will be depriued o some grace corresponding to the chalice, to wit, that of spirituall consolation, and exhilaration of the soul in the seruice of God, which Priests haue by receauing both kindes.

Answer.

First I answer that it is sufficient for the defence of the Catholique Roman faith that lay people in receauing vnder one kind, are not depriued of any grace necessary to saluation, which they should be were they obliged by vertu of Christs institution to receaue both. And which our aduersaries presse against vs. seeing therefore the same habituall iustifiing and sauing grace is receaued by one kind as well as by both, though he who re-

Concil. Trid. sess. 21. c. 3.

ceaue

ceaues both were ſuppoſed to receaue extenſiuely more then they which receaue one only, yet this hath noe greater difficulty then that Prieſts being accouſtumed and permitted euery day to ſay maſſe receaue by vertu of oftener communicating more habituall grace then lay people who promiſcuouſly haue noe ſuch practiſe or permiſſion, they being by acts of obedience to the holy Church, and humility proportionable to there own eſtat to ſupply the want of that extent of graces which are conferred vppon Prieſts by vertu of theyr dayly receauing this Sacrament, noe wrong being done them ſo long as both in this and that of communicating vnder one kind, they are depriued of noe grace neceſſary to ſaluation, and by other acts of vertues and good workes may if they will, (being aſſiſted by the grace of God) exercife and ſupply that defect wherein by reaſon of the Sacrament they fall ſhort of Prieſts. I ſay there is noe wrong done them, becauſe Chriſtians are obliged to haue reſpect not only to theyr own parricular ſpituall profit in increaſe of grace by the Sacrament, but alſo to the reuerence which is due to it, they muſt be content to want that increaſe when it cannot be obtained but by ſome irreuerence offerred to this diuine Sacrament. Thus though both Prieſts and lay men might haue more degrees of grace by cele-

celebrating and communicating two or three times a day, then by once, yet becauſe this inuolues a want of reuerence to the body and bloud of Chriſt, it is but once a yeare generally amongſt Catholikes permittrd to Prieſts, and neuer to lay people, neither by Catholiques nor Proteſtants, the ſame would follow if all lay men were licenced promiſcuouſly to communicate euery day, and noe leſſe, were they permitted to receaue vnder both kindes as I ſhall ſhew here after: whence followes that as out of the reſpect which they are bound to bere to this heauenly myſtery they are obliged to refraine from communicating euery day, and vppon noe day to receaue more then once: ſo are they to abſtaine (the Church ſo commanding) from receauing the chalice. Secondly concerning actuall auxiliary graces, which are ſupernaturall pious thoughts and inſpirations to good, conferred by vertu of this Sacrament and proper to it, ſome doctours hold that there is a different actuall grace correſponding to the chalice from that of the hoſt, the one of ſtrenghning proper to meate, the other of exhilaration proper only to drinke. yet the common tenet of doctours is contrary, and ſo it will only come to a ſchoole Queſtion not neceſſary to be treated here, wherein the more common and negatiue opinion ſeemes to me more

pious

pious and honorable to this Sacrament, for it wil be ſufficient to ſaue the proper effects of theſe two kindes that there be actuall graces correſponding to meate and drinke, the one of corroborating, the other of exhilerating, as the primary, not as the only actuall fruits of this ſpirituall food and drinke, ſo that by the hoſt by reaſon ofits ineſtimable and illimitated vertu be communicated to the receauer certaine actuall graces ſtrenghtning him in time of tentation as the primary effect of that kinde, and yet the other of exhilerating in time of ſorow alſo, as the ſecondary and leſſe principall of the ſacred hoſt. and the ſame diſcours holds proportionably of the chalice, ſo that each kinde conferres theſe different graces, but in a different order and manner. and by conſequence he who receaues either hath the very ſame actuall graces communicated to him noe leſſe then he who receaues both, and lay people are not depriued of any ſpecies of actuall gtace due to this Sacrament, which Prieſts haue. Now that this doctrine much conducing to the honour and glory and grounded in the boundleſſe perfection of this Sacrament, is cleere tough to ſuch as only conſider that this ſpirituall banquet vnder each ſpecies containes noe leſſe then Chriſt himſelfe. who is not only the food, but alſo the drinke of our ſonles, and ſo the holy

Eccleſ.24. v.29. Matt.5.6. Scripture ſpeaking of him telleth vs, he who eateth me ſhall yet hunger, and he who drinketh me ſhall yet thirſt, and if we may hunger and thirſt after iuſtice, and the ſame iuſtice be both able to ſatisfie our hunger and quench our thirſt, that is, be both meat and drinke to vs whenſoeuer we receaue it, why ſhould we denye theſe effects to the fountaine of iuſtici our deare Sauiour whenſoeuer he is worthily receaued vnder either forme in this Sacrament. and if the materiall manna had the taſte, ſweetneſſe and ſtrength of all other different meates, why ſhould we not attribute to this ſpirituall and diuine manna the ſtrength ſweetnes and perfection both of all meates, and drinks alſo whenſoeuer it is rightly receaued? And if ſpeaking of diuine Wid.7.11 wiſdome Salomon tell vs that all good came to him togeather with it, why ſhould we limite that wiſdome of God more then is neceſſarie in this Sacrament. In a word, if ſome corporall meates haue alſo the vertu of drinke, and ſome corporall drinkes the force of meate to nourith, why ſhould we denye this to the beſt of all meates and drinks the body and bloud of our Sauiour? for if the leaſt drop of his bloud or action of his body was ſufficient to ſatisfie for the ſinnes of infinite worlds, why ſhould we frame ſo pore an opinion of them both in this Sacrament that whenſoeuer they

they are truly receaued they haue not power vnder each kind both to nouriſh ſtrenghen, exhilerate and conferre ſpiritually all the fruits and profits correſpondent to thoſe which are found in any, or in all other meates and drinkes togeathe r ſo that not only habituall iuſtifying and ſanctifving grace neceſſary to ſaluation, and actuall Sacramentall graces correſpondent to that of meat by way of ſpirituall nouriſhment in the hoſt, and of drink by way of ſpirituall exhileration in the chalice, but both theſe graces are conferred by each kind apart that proper to meat primarily by the hoſt, and to drinke primarily by the chalice, but yet ſecondarily and by way of a ſuperabundant vertu and efficacy in this diuine refection the hoſt exhilerates & comforts, and the chalice nouriſheth and ſtrenghteneth correſpondent to all corporal meates and drinkes and conferred ſeparatly by them are ioyntly receaued by each of theſe apart: and thus as that of the hymne of *corpus Chriſti* is moſt true: *dedit fragilibus corporis ferculum, dedit & triſtibus ſanguinis poculum*: he gaue the food of his body to the infirme and the cup of his blood to the ſad, whereby are deſigned the primary effects of the hoſt by way of ſtrenghtning, and the chalice by way of exhilerating ſo it is alſo true which is affirmed in the ſame office: *Panem de cælo præſtitiſti eis omne delectamen-*

tum in ſe habentem: thou haſt giuen them bread from heauen hauing all delight and comfort in it: whereby ſeemes to be aſſribed to the ſacred hoſt the effect of delighting and exhilerating ſuch as worthily receaue it, and noe leſſe thoſe other verſicles which follow in the ſame feaſt: *cibauit illos ex adipe frumenti, & de petra melle ſaturauit eos*: he hath fed them with the fattnes of wheat, where the delightfull nouriſhmēt of the ſoule is expreſſed: and ſatiated them with honny from the rock, which expreſſeth the ſweet feeding of the ſoul by the ſacred chalice. much more might be ſaid of this particular, were it to be diſputed in the ſchooles but in this occaſion I iudge noe more neceſſary ſeeing the queſtion it ſelfe is not neceſſary for the defence of Catholike faith in this point. Thus farre I haue anſwered the difficulties which can be drawn from the bare inſtitution abſtracting from the command of our Sauiour expreſſed either in the inſtitution, or elſe where concerning this Sacrament, which I will now anſwer very breefly.

Objection.

Our Sauiour ſaith: drinke ye all of it, therefore he commands all Chriſtians to drinke of the cup in this Sacrament.

Anſwer.

Anſwer.

Our Sauiour ſaith Iohn 13. *If I haue waſhed your feet your Lord and maiſter, you muſt alſo waſh one anothers feet*, therefore all Chriſtians are commanded by our Sauiour to waſh one an others feet: or thus our Sauiour Marc. 16. *Goenig into the whol world preach the Goſpel to all creatures.* and Matt. 28. *Goe and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the father*, &c. therefore he commands all Chriſtians to teach the Goſpel and baptize all nations: or thus to come ſomthing nearer to this matter in the drinking of a cupp. Luc. 22. our Sauiour ſaith before the Sacrament was inſtituted: and he tooke the cupp and ſaid: take and diuide amongſt you, &c. therefore all Chriſtians are commanded to take and drinke wine which is noe ſacrament, yea before they receaue the ſacrament, as our Sauiour commanded the Apoſtles to doe here. or laſtly thus to inſtance in the inſtitution it ſelfe Matth. 26. our Sauiour ſaith: *Take and eate this is my Body*: therefore he commanded all Chriſtians to take the hoſt into theyr hands, and then eate it, as he did the Apoſtles. many ſuch like inſtances might be giuen whence (if we ſtand to the ſole and bare word of ſcripture it will be as eaſily deduced that all Chriſtians are commanded many things which Proteſtants ſay they are

not bound to doe, as from this command: *drinke yee all of this:* giuen to the Apoſtles, can be drawn that all Chriſtians are commanded to drinke of the chalice becauſe the Apoſtles were then commanded to doe it.

If it ſhould be replyed that in the other commands alleaged is not found the word (all) *drinke ye all of this* as we finde here, and therefore are not ſo generall to comprehend all Chriſtians. I anſwer that the word (all) as appeares hy S. Marke: *and they all drunke of it:* only ſignifies all the Apoſtles there preſent, none excepted, for our Sauiour ſaid not: let all Chriſtians drinke of this, *but drinke ye all of this.* If it ſhould be demanded why ſhould our Sauiour ſay: drinke yee all of this more then eate yee all of this; adding the word (all) only to the chalice and not to the hoſt, but only to ſhew the vniuerſall neceſſitie of drinking. I anſwer firſt that (all) cannot poſſibly be added. for that reaſon, for Proteſtants confeſſe that there is as vniuerſall neceſſitie for all Chriſtians to eate the bread comprehended in theſe words: *take eate this is my Body*, without the word (all) as of drinking the cup in theſe: *drinke yee all of this.* Secondly I anſwer that the reaſon of adding the word (all) more to the chalice then to the hoſt, was becauſe our Sauiour hauing broken the hoſt into differēt peeces gaue to each Apoſtle one and ſo there was

noe

noe neceſſitie to command them all to eate of the ſame particle, but hauing giuen but one cup amongſt them, it was more neceſſary for the full declaration of his minde (which was that all the Apoſtles there preſet ſhould drinke of that cupp,) to expreſſe himſelfe in theſe termes: drinke ye all of this.

Secondly I anſwer to the maine objection that if we ſtand preciſely in theſe words of Scripture, it can neuer be conuinced that any precept is contained either in theſe *take eate*: or in theſe: *drinke yee all of this*; for they are capable to ſignifie a meere inuitation or intreaty as great perſons ordinarily are accouſtomed when they haue other inferiours at theyr table to ſay, eate or drinke of this or that, not commanding but inuiting: and it belongs to Proteſtãts who ſtand ſo ſtrictly to the bare expreſſe words of Scripture to conuince by the ſole expreſſe words the contrary.

Thirdly if wee either by vniuerſall tradition of Chriſtians, or by ſome other expreſſe commands in ſcripture of communicating, grant that euen in theſe words, eate, drinke &c, a ſtrickt command was giuen, ſeeing ſome commands, oblige all Chriſtians, others all Biſhops & Prieſts, and others the Apoſtles only, we can notwithſtanding giue a reaſon why theſe words: drinke yee all of this, binde the

Apoſtles only, and extend not themſelues to all Chriſtians. for the declaration of this. when the circumſtances are ſuch that the command can haue noe place but for that preſent time when it is giuen, it is cleare that what our Sauiour ſpake to the Apoſtles is giuen to the Apoſtles only; as when our Sauiour ſaid to S. Peeter: *putt vp thy ſwod into the ſcabbard*; or to the three Apoſtles: *riſe let vs goe* &c. and a thou ſand ſuch like.

Secondly: when the common tradition of Chriſtendome tells vs that ſuch commands as were giuen to the Apoſtles were neuer eſteemed to oblige theyr ſucceſſours.

Thirdly: when the matter commanded is common to the Apoſtles and all other Prieſts and not limited by any circumſtance mentioned or inſinuated in Scriptute, to the Apoſtles only (if the generall and continuuall practiſe of Chriſtendome be not contrarie) it is to be vnderſtood to oblige not only the perſons of the Apoſtles but all Biſhops and Prieſts in ſucceeding ages, ſuch as are the preceptes of teaching the Goſpell, Baptizing abſoluing from ſinnes &c. and of conſecrating ſacrifiſing and receauing this bleſſed Sacrament.

Fourthly: when the matter of the precept in it ſelfe may be common to all Chriſtians as was the waſhing of one an others feet, the abſti-

abſtinence from blond, and the receauing of both kindes, and hath noe limitation to the Apoſtles or Prieſts only preſcribed in the Scripture there can be noe other rule to know which precept obliges all Chriſtians, which not, ſaue the conſtant and generall tradition of the Chriſtian Church. For by this only we know (as well Proteſtants as Catholikes) that the precept of waſhing of feet bindes not though it be vniuerſally & ſtrictly inioineyd in Scripture without any limitation of time or perſons, and noe leſſe though all Chriſtians are of themſelues capable to receaue both kindes, and the command be giuen to the Apoſtles to receaue them, yet this command by the churches perpetuall tradition, or permitting many lay Chriſtians to receaue in one only kinde, & by the Proteſtants couſtome of not communicating little infants, ſhew cleerly that this precept is not to be extended to all Chriſtians without exception. and if Proteſtants notwitſtanding the word, *all*, limitate it only to ſuch as are arriued to the yeares of d iſcretion, without any ground in the bare words of the text, to exclude little children, only becauſe their own practiſe approues it; why may not Roman Catholikes limit it to the Apoſtles then preſent hauing both a ground in the text, becauſe the words were ſpoken to them only, and the vniuerſall

tradition of the Christian Church permitting many lay persons to communicate in one only kinde, and little children eyther in one, or neyther, as I shall here after demonstrate.

Objection.

The second precept alleaged by reformists for communion vnder both kindes, is in these words: *doe this in remembrance of me*, which being to be vnderstood of something commanded to be done not then, but for insuing times, as I haue already shewed, are not to be limited as spoken to the Apostles only, then present, and so seeme to be extended to all Christians. especially if they be limited to Priests only, there will be noe command at all in the institution obliging all Christians to receaue either both, or either kind of this Sacrament.

Answer.

These words: *doe this in remembrance of me*. according to all that which is commanded in them, cannot be extended to any more then Priests, for here is euidently commanded the blessing, consecrating, offering, sacrificing and administring of this Sacrament, for it is to doe what our Sauiour then did, which according to Catholiques comprehends all these particulars, and according to Protestants some of them

them,and if the conſecrating and adminiſtration of this Sacrament were not commanded in theſe words there would be noe command at all for them in the whol inſtitution, nor very probably in the whol new Teſtament.

Secondly if we ſtick cloſely to the bare words,noe man can conuince from them only that all Chriſtians are obliged to receaue this Sacrament vnder both, or either kinde, for the cleargy men might haue been obliged to conſecrate and adminiſter this Sacrament, though the layity were not obliged to receaue it,as they are bound to adminiſter Prieſt hood and mariage when they are iuſtly required: though noe man haue any abſolute command either to be a Prieſt, or to mary, and conſequently are not bound to receaue thoſe two Sacraments.

Thirdly all that thoſe words import as they ſtand, may be ſatisfied probably if we ſay that not euery Prieſt or lay man in particular is obliged to conſecrate or communicate by force of them,but that they conteyne a precept giuen to the church in generall that what our Sauiour here commands, be done as certainly there is a command giuen to the church to conferre Prieſthood,abſolution and extreme Vnction &c. and yet noe Biſhop or Prieſt hath in particular any ſuch abſo-

abſolute obligation by reaſon of his Prieſthood only neither is any in particular bound to adminiſter them by a poſitiue diuine precept, giuen directly to them, though accidentally they may haue a ſtrickt obligation according to different circumſtances to adminiſter the ſaid Sacrament.

Fourtly: though it ſhould be granted that theſe words: *doe this* &c. containe a precept obliging all Chriſtians arriued to yeares of diſcretion to communicate ſometimes, yet this toucheth only the receauing vnder the forme of bread, if we ſtand to the expreſſe words of the inſtitution being ſaid after the conſecration of the hoſt and before the chalice. And the precept recorded by S. Paul after the chalice is not abſolute to conſecrate and receaue that, but ſo often as it is drunke, to doe it in remembrance of our Sauiour: *doe this as often as you ſhall drinke in remembrance of me*, ſaid our Sauiour.

Laſtly: though from the ſole force of theſe words: *doe this in remembrance of me*, conſidered as they ſtand in Scripture, noe forcible argument can be drawn to proue a poſitiue precept in particular binding euery Chriſtian, to receaue ſometimes this Sacramẽt vnder either or both kindes, and though the generall doctrine of the church be that there is noe diuine precept obliging more to receaue the hoſt then

hen the chalice, and the couſtome of the primitiue church was to giue to ſome the chalice noe leſſe without the hoſt, then to others the hoſt without the chalice. and that ſome late Learned Writers affirme that there is noe ſuch precept conteyned in holy Scripture; yet becauſe S. Thomas and the common ſtreame of doctours after him grant a generall precept of receauing this Sacrament to be conteyned in them, and that S. Paul ſeemes to giue ſufficient ground to thinke that this command: *doe this* &c. was to be extended to the actuall receauing of this Sacrament by the laity, by mentioning drinking in the conditionall command of the conſecrated chalice, and deducing from the inſtitution what preparation all Chriſtians ſhould make to receaue worthily this Sacrament, as appeares v. 27. to the end of the chapter: and mouued by this authority I grant that all Chriſtians are here commanded ſometimes in there liues to frequent this Sacrament, yet ſo that lay people ſatisfie this precept by receauing one only kind, or both, according to the order preſcribed by the holy Church, as ſhee is mouued by different times or circumſtances now to ordaine the receauing of both, now of one alone, to ſome the ſole hoſt, and to others the chalice only; for ſeeing this precept was giuen before the conſecration of the chalice,

though

though it induce noe more neceſſity of receauing the hoſt then the chalice, yet it ſhewes euidently that if the hoſt alone be receaued, this precepte is ſatisfied and by a manifeſt paritie and equalitie betwixt the two kindes that if it be ſufficient to ſatisfie this precept to receaue the ſole hoſt, it will alſo be ſufficient to receaue the chalice without the hoſt, the one containing nos leſſe the whole eſſence of this Sacrament, then the other, as I haue already declared.

So that in this command: *doe this in remembrance of me.* the word, this, ſeemes to ſignifie (according to S. Thomas now cited) whatſoeuer our Sauiour then did, as neceſſarily appertaining to the eſſence & ſubſtãce of this Sacrament; and though this abſolute preecpt was giuen before the chalice, yet the ground of it being the very ſame in the hoſt and chalice, it is equally to be applyed to the receauing either of them; yet diſiunctiuely only that is, that this Sacrament is to be receaued by euery one either vnder each or both kindes; as the church ſhall determine.

Obiection.

The maine difficulty therefore comes at laſt to that text, Ioh. 6. *vnleſſe* &c. which as it deliuers an abſolute neceſſitie of receauing this moſt holy Sacrament, ſo ſeemes it in expreſſe

greſſe termes to impoſe the ſame neceſſitie of receauing vnder both kindes, making mention of eating the fleſh, and drinking the blood of our Sauiour, as neceſſarie to ſaluation. *Verily, verily I ſay unto you, vnleſſe you eate the fleſh of the ſone of man, and drinke his blood; you ſhall not haue life in you.*

Anſwer.

I am not ignorant that Catholique doctours giue different anſwers to this text which I leaue to be peruſed in theyr particular treatiſes of this point. I anſwer breefly and clearely that in this text is comprehended a neceſſity both of eating and drinking that is, there is a generall command giuen to the whol generality of Chriſtians to receaue the body of Chriſt by way of eating, and his blood by way of drinking, and conſequently of receauing vnder both kindes, which muſt alwayes be performed by the generall body of Chriſtians, that they may haue life in them, and that this may be performed there is a particular neceſſitie put vppon euery particular Chriſtian to concurre to the execution of this generall command, not that euery one in particular is obliged both to eate and drinke really this Sacrament, but that ſome eating, others drinking, others doing both, each particular conferres to the performance of this

this command of eating, and drinking the body and blood of Chriſt: wherevnto the generallity is abſolutly obliged: ſo that this whol command is to be performed by all as ioyntly and vnitedly conſidered and that it may be thus ioyntly done by all, each particular is obliged to ſome part of it, thereby concurring partially to the whol performance. Thus when our Sauiour commanded his Apoſtles to teach and baptize all nations, he gaue a generall and vniuerſall command to them and theyr ſucceſſours to performe this worke ioyntly amongſt them, not commanding each one in particular to preach and baptize the whol world, for that neither was nor could, morally ſpeaking, haue been done, but that this might be done by all, each one in particular was obliged to performe his part, and to cõcurre to the conuerſion and inſtruction of all nations, ſo that though noe one was bound by vertu of this command either to conuert all nations, or any one in particular: each one was obliged to labour towards the conuerſion of ſome part or other of the world, ſo that by the labours of each, at laſt the whol worke might be accompliſhed. Thus our Sauiour ſent his diſciples ſaying: goe and cure all diſeaſes &c. that is each one curing ſome, all might be cured amongſt them. thus after his reſurrection he foretold what

Matth. 28. v. 19. Marc. 16. v. 15.

Iohn 10. 9.

what cures and miracles ſhould be done by his diſciples, not that each ſhould doe all theſe miracles, but that amongſt them ſuch miracles ſhould be done: and thus the holy Euangeliſt affirmes that the Apoſtles of Chriſt preached euery where, not that each preached euery where, but that all of them togeather were ſpread ouer the whol world. and in the ſame manner may it now be ſaid that Chriſtians eate the fleſh and drinke the blood of Chriſt, not that each doth both, but that it is done amongſt them, by reaſon that each in particular is obliged either to both, or either of them: and ſo the whol precept will be performed amongſt them. Neither ſeemes the context of S. Iohn to exact more then this; for in what goes immediately before, the doubt which the Iewes had there, to which our Sauiour anſwers in this text, was not whether it was neceſſary to ſaluation for euery one both to eate the fleſh, and drinke the blood of Chriſt, for he had as then made noe mention at all of drinking his blood, but they only doubted how his fleſh could be really eaten. *how can this man, ſay they, giue vs his fleſh to eate?* ſo that our Sauiours anſwer to this doubt of theirs, was fully ſufficient by telling them that it was not only poſſible, but neceſſary to ſaluation to eate the fleſh and drinke the blood of Iohn 6.

the sonne of man, that is, that those two actions should be really and truly done amongst such as were to haue eternall life. but seeing their doubt was not (supposing the reality of this eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ, amongst such as were to haue eternall life.) whether it were necessary that euery one in particular were both to eate and drinke (for they neuer so much as dreamed of this question) it is noe way necessary to affirme (by vertu of this context) that our Saviour defined there that it was necessary for euery one in particular to per forme both: but it was sufficient that both these actions were truly and really so to be accomplished in his church, that the generalitie was to doe both, and each Christian in particular to concurre either by performing one, or both to the accomplishment of this iniunction. for if each in particular had not been obliged to concurre to the performance of this command, the whol church would not haue been bound to correspond with it, seeing their is noe more reason to binde one then another to the performance of it, as in the command of teaching and baptizing the whol world by the Apostles, each particular was bound to performe his part, seeing that our Saviour had commanded it should he done amonst them: and there was noe reason that one should be

more

more obliged to doe it, then an other.

And though there be many other commands giuen by our Sauiour to the church in generall which oblige not each particular Christian to the performance of any part of them, but only the gouuernours of the church to see that by some or other they be put in execution, yet this precept is of an other nature binding the whol community of Christians to the whol and each particular to some part of this command. For seeing there is noe more reason why one Christian should be more exempted from it then an other, the concurring to it falls equally vppon all; for though Priests when they consecrate and sacrifice haue each in particular an obligation to communicate, yet according to a probable opinion, they haue noe obligation in particular proceeding from any diuine precept to consectate, or sacrifize; but all their absolute obligation to communicate is taken from this and other like commands, which we haue treated; so that though noe particular Priest were bound by diuine precept to say masse, yet they are bound to communicate by reason of these precepts, which could not be vnlesse euery Christian were obliged in perticular to concurre to the performance of this generall command with an equall obligation.

Objection.

If it ſhoud be ſaid that the church may ſufficiently complie with the generall command by prouiding that it be ſtill kept in execution by ſome particular perſons as ſhe complies with many others.

Anſwer.

In anſwer firſt that if ſhould one ſtād meerely to the bare letter of Scripture in theſe precepts, this might be ſaid, but if we take the ſence of it according to the common ſtraine of doctours, euery particular will be obliged by them.eſpecially ſeeing that S.Paul extends this matter of communion to each particular.

Secondly as it was not in the power of the Apoſtels to exempt any of the twelf from concurring to the conuerſion of all nations commanded by our Sauiour and to haue it accompliſhed by the reſt which they ſhould haue appointed, becauſe each of them in particular was bound to labour in it by diuine precept, where in the church cannot diſpence ſo (ſeeing we haue the ſame authority of doctonrs and tradition for the obliging each particular by this command: *vnleſſe yon eate*, as each Apoſtle by that: *goe and teach all nations* &c.) it may be denied that the church hath power to exempt any one from this precept by

by hauing it performed by other Chriſtians appointed by her authority.

Thirdly, had this Sacrament been left free, as Prieſthood and mariage were, without any diuine precept that euery Chriſtian ſometimes in their liues receiue it, the church neither would nor could haue obliged each Chriſtian in particular to receaue it once a yeare, as ſhee obliges none to receaue Prieſthood or mariage becauſe they were left free by our Sauiour.

Objection.

If it ſhould be here obiectedthat in the command of teaching &c. each Apoſtle in particular could uot conuert all, and if each had been bound to teach and baptize all, the command could not haue any conuenient ſenſe, but each Chriſtian is able eaſily both to eate and drinke this Sacrament and ſo there is no parity in the command of teching with that of communicating.

Anſwer.

I anſwer firſt that this command is not inſtanced as like in all things, but to this end that ſeeing this precept of teaching &c. muſt he vnderſtood of all in general and each in particular, and that there be ſuch commands in Scripture that though this of eating and

drinking this Sacrament might haue been ſo vnderſtood that each Criſtian is bound both to eate and drinke, as being a thing very feaſable, yet this Sacramentall precept may be vnderſtood as the other muſt be, and if it be poſſible to vnderſtand it ſo, our aduerſaries will neuer be able to conuince thence the neceſſity for euery particular to receaue both kindes, and yet there will be a neceſſity by vertu of theſe words to receaue one.

I Anſwer ſecondly that there is as great a neceſſity to vnderſtand this precept in the foreſaid manner drawn from the truth of Scripture, as there is for vnderſtanding the command of teaching drawn for the force of nature. That which followes the text in the enſuing verſes makes this matter quite out of queſtion, for though our Sauiour here declared the neceſſity in the plurall number: *Niſi manducauerith* &c. *vnleſſe you eate* &c. of eating his fleſh and drinking his blood as belonging to the generallity of Chriſtians, & the words, *in vobis*, in Greeke, ἐν ὑμῖν, you ſhall not haue life *in you*, ſignifie, according to the Greeke phraſe, very familiarly in Scripture, *amongſt you*, which is referred to the whol congregation of Chriſtians, and not to each particular. Yet when he expreſſed himſelfe in the ſingular number: *Qui manducat hunc panem, qui manducat me* &c. he who eateth this bread, he who eateth

Gal. 3. 1.
Iames 4. 1
1. Par. 5. 3.
1. Cor. 1. 10
Act. 25. 2.
Act. 17. 22

eateth me &c. and addeſſed his ſpeach to particular perſons, he attributes eternall life to the ſole eating of him, and that heauenly bread as appeares in the ſaid text: *he who eateth me ſhall liue by me; he who eateth this bread ſhall liue for euer* &c. and hence it is clearly deduced not only that theſe words: *vnleſſe ye eate* &c, doe not euidently include ea neceſſity for euery particular perſon to receaue both kindes, but that they cannot poſſibibily include any ſuch neceſſity, without a contradiction betwixt this text and the text following now cited; for if he who eates the fleſh of our Sauiour hath eternall life, as thoſe textes affirme, then it can not be true that vnleſſe each particular both eate and drinke he ſhall not haue life eternall, and hence alſo appeares a neceſſity of vnderſtanding theſe words, that though all in generall be bound to receaue both amongſt them, yet none in patticular is bound to receaue both: but each is partially to concurre to accompliſh this command as each Apoſtle was that of teaching and baptizing all nations.

Obiection.

Some happily may anſwer with Caluin that though eating be only named in the text now cited, yet drinking alſo is there included, and to be vnderſtood as being con-

nected with it in the former text: vnleſſe you eate &c.

Anſwer.

That more is vnderſtood then is expreſſed in any place of Scripture, is not vppon light coniectures to be ſuppoſed, but to be prouued by ſolide and conuincing arguments, otherwiſe each light headed nouelist might at his pleaſure frame to himſelfe certain apparent congruities to extend the words of Scripture, and to make them import more then they ſignifie in themſelues, and ſo multiplie Synecdoches whereſoeuer it comes to his purpoſe. Seeing therefore I haue ſhewed that there is noe neceſſity to ſtrech theſe textes beyond the common and vſuall ſignification of the words, by giuing at leaſt a probable ſatisfaction to whatſoeuer they alleadge to proue the contrary, let our aduerſaries make good that there it a neceſſity of the drawing theſe words beyond their naturall ſignification, or that more words are ſuppoſed then are expreſſed in the text, and we will yeeld to this explication.

But this diſcours of our Sauiour: is ſo farre from giuing the leaſt ground to any ſuch like, improprieties (the common refuge of our Aduerſaries when they cannot auoyd the force of the expreſſe words, and proper ſenſe of Scrip-

Scripture) that it rather confirmes the proper and natiue signification of these words: *he who eateth this bread shall liue for euer:* when he saith: *as I liue by my father, so he who eateth me shall liue by me.* whence is (at the least more probably then Protestants can proue the contrary) inferred that as our Sauiour liues totally and compleately by his father without the addition of any thing else, so Christians liue by worthily eating this heauenly bread without the addition of drinking, or any other action necessary to giue life as a part of this Sacrament.

But that I may make the exposition which I haue giuen of these words, yet more plaine and forcible, I will propose an instance of a command of this kind giuen to the Israelites euen in matter of a Sacrament, where they Exod. 12. are in generall commanded by families to celebrate the passeouer by taking killing and shedding the blood and sprinkling it vppon the posts of their dores, rosting and eating the paschall lambe &c. not that euery one in particular was obliged to performe all these actions, but some to one, and others to others with decency and proportion, though absolutly speaking, euery one in particular must haue concurred with the rest to the performance of them all, and yet the whol familly by concurring partially were obliged to the

performance of all. and happily this mystery beeing a figure of the Eucharist, the only command of eating without any mention of drinking may giue some aduantage to the coustome of eating alone amongst Roman Catholiques, but this only by the way as a congruence. And yet to come nerer to our present Question, when our Sauiour in the command giuen in the institution: *doe this* &c, commanded that what he had done, as substantially belonging to this Sacrament, should be done in his church, that is, that this mystery should be celebrated, the host and chalice consecrated, the body and blood of our Sauiour vndloodily be sacrifized and receaued, yet noe Christian dare affirme that all these actions here commanded were to be performed by euery Christian in particular, for then all Christian men, weomen and children were to performe the office of Priests, but that euery one was to concurre to the performance of this precept by doing what belongs to his degree and calling: and seeing all these actions now mentioned were not to be performed by each Christian, how can it be euer prouued that each was both to eate & drinke, seeing that by performance of either of these actions separately, each might partially concurre to the accomplishment of that precept, as they may also to this: *nisi manducaueritis;*

vnlesse

vnleſſe you eate the fleſh of the ſone of man and drinke his blood, you ſhall not haue life in you: that is vnleſſe you concurre each in particular to the performāce of this command either by eating alone or drinking alone, or performing both togeather, each reſpectiuely to his calling, office and order preſcribed by the church, you ſhall not haue life amongſt you, that is theſe actions are neceſſary that life may be found in the Church of Chriſt, or amongſt Chriſtians. for this is a command which muſt be fulfilled amongſt them, and all are bound in particular to concurre, one way or other, to the fulfilling of it, ſeeing there is noe reaſon that one ſhould be more obliged then an other, and ſo if any one were not obliged, none in particular would be bound to fulfill it, and then enery one in particular might lawfully abſtaine and conſequently there would be noe performance of this command amongſt Chriſtians, which would make the command to be void and of noe effect, quite contrary to the expreſſe words and intention of our Sauiour.

From this whol diſcours may appeare what an vnworthy and baſe eſteeme our aduerſaries frame of the moſt ſacred body and blood of our Sauiour, not thinking that either of them (as they are in this Sacrament) is fit and capable to conferre ſauing grace to ſuch

as

as deuoutly receaue them, which cannot but derogate insufferably from that infinite worth and dignity which all Christians haue euer conceaued in them. for as it is a most certaine and receaued tenet that not only the shedding of the least drop of his most precious blood, but the least action or motion of his most sacred body was abundantly sufficient for the redemption of the whol world, and a million of worlds more: why should they now call in Question the sufficiency of the same body and blood receaued apart each of them to communicate ineffable fauours and graces (all grounded in his sacred passion) to the worthy receauers of them.

Obiection.

If they answer that they doubt not of the worth and power of each of these, but of the will of our Sauiour whether he ordained that they separately or only ioyntly should conferre grace, or commanded that allwayes both should be receaued?

Answer.

I answer that seeing noe lesse the body then the blood of our Sauiour as separately taken in the Eucharist is abondantly in it selfe fit and able to sanctifie the soule of him who dewly receaues it, and that there is noe cleere

text

text in Scripture which conuinces that one of them alone can not ſanctifie, or rather that there be moſt cleere texts which proue that one alone can doe it: and that there is noe expreſſe command giuen in Scripture to all particular Chriſtians to receaue both and the couſtome both of the primitiue, ancient, late, and moderne church is euidently to the contrary, I cannot ſee what can haue mouued our aduerſaries to thinke that one kinde ſuffices not, ſaue a low and meane eſteeme they haue of the vertu and force of our Sauiours body and blood conſiderced ſeparately in themſelues in this Sacrament.

The ſecond defect of reſpect and reuerence which our aduerſaries ſhew to the ſacred blood of Chriſt in this particular is the little care they haue how much of that diuine chalice and how often it be ſpilt vppon the ground, ſprinkled vppon the cloarhes of communicants, caſt out of the ſacred veſſels, abuſed, loſt, trod vnder foot by a thouſand indiſcretions, irreuerences, negligēces, miſchances by reaſon of the great multitudes of people of all moſt all ages, ſexes, conditions, who not only once or twice a yeare, as amongſt the new reformers, but each month, fortnight and weeke communicate through out the whol Roman Church, as dayly experienees teach, and eſpecially in the former

age

age in Bohemia where leaue hauing been granted for the Catholiques to receaue both kindes for theyr comfort, they found not withstanding all the diligences which morally could be vsed, so many and great inconueniences in this kind both to the communicants and Priests that they quicly grew weary of it, and were compelled to leaue it of. But our aduersaries eyther not beleeuing it is his precious blood, or little regarding what becomes of it, if they beleeue it, will and must haue the vse of the chalice, though it be affected with a thousand irreuerences, to satisfie theyr willfull, and vngrounded importunity. But Roman Catholiques beare both a tender loue to this most pretious blood of our Sauiour, and so indeauour all they can to preserue it from all irreuerences and preuent all occasions as much as is possible of indangering the least drop of the consecrated chalice to be spilt or lost; and frame a most high esteeme of his sacred body as conteyned vnder the formes of bread to be alone sufficient to feed them to eternall life. Imitating in both these the care and esteeme of the primitiue church, which both imposed very heauy and seuere prnances vppon all such as permitted any the least quantity of the facred chalice to be spilt, and was accoustomed to giue this Sacrament sometimes in forme of bread

bread only both to hermites in the wildernes, pilgrimes in theyr iournies, ſicke perſons in theyr beds, laymen in theyr houſes and children in the church: and in formie of wine only to little infants in their cradles, which cleerely conuinces that the primitiue church had noe beleefe or knowledgement of any abſolute neceſſity or diuine precept to receaue allwayes both; which not withſtanding as it read as diligently, ſo vnderſtood it more clearly and obſerued more punctually the laws and commãds of Chriſt, then our aduerſaries now doe.

Dion. Alex. ep. ad Sabia. Beda Hiſt. lib. 4. c. 14. Prat. Spir. c. 79. Enaſ. li. 4. c. 35. Euag. Matiſco. 2. c. 6

Some there are who being conuinced of the reall preſence, and that there is neither neceſſity nor command in Scripture of receauing allwayes both, notwithſtanding for the precedent places objected, ſay that euery particular Chriſtian is obliged ſometimes in his life to communicate vnder both at the ſame time, and thus they eſteeme themſelues both to agree with thoſe places of Scripture now cited which affirme that by eating alone eternall life is acquired, and auoid thoſe inconueniences which happen to the blood of our Sauiour amongſt ſuch multitudes of Chriſtians ſo frequently communicating by granting that this Sacrament ordinarily may be receaued vnder the formes of bread only: and agree with the practiſe of the primitiue Chriſtians who though they

often

often receiued vnder one priuately, or when the other could not conueniently be had: yet at other times they receiued publickly vnder both: and on the other side conforme themselues both to the institution of our Sauiour and those other precepts of receiuing both by doing it sometimes in their liues when the precept obliges. This opinion though it seeme fairely to compose all difficulties, yet the newnesse and vnhardnesse of it, where there nothig else, render it suspect of superficiality and falshood, for how is it possible that each Christian should haue so weighty an obligation, and neither any doctour in the moderne Roman Church, so much as dreame of it, nor any amongst her present aduersaries once presse it against vs, or thinke of it themselues. or if we looke to the late fiue hundred yeares before vs where in it hath been the constome in many particular churches to communicate publickly vnder the formes of bread only without the least reflection or practise of any such precept, as S. Thomas wittnesses, those churches always communicating the laity vnder one kinde only, or if we ascend to the primitiue times, there is noe step nor impression to be found of any such precept, for then they not sometimes only or euer by way of diuine precept, for so much as can be gathered from the authours of those times, but frequently

3. parte qu. 150. ar. 2. cor.

quently in publick celebrations of thoſe myſteries commnnicated vnder both. and thoſe childeren which communicated vnder one only kinde, we neuer read to haue communicated vnder both, though they died in their childhood, which not withſtanding they ſhould haue done, had the Chriſtians of the primitiue times beleeued any ſuch need, as is here conceiued of ſometimes communicating vnder both. how, I ſay, is it poſſible that this opinion ſhould be true & ſolide ſeeing neither moderne nor ancient, nor primitiue times, nor friends nor aduerſaries of the Roman Church ſo much as once mention it? but beſide the newneſſe it hath other reaſons enough to conuince it of falſhood, for firſt when the primitiue Chriſtians communicated little infants preſently after baptiſme vnder the formes of wine, only they neuer are read to haue giuen it vnder both if they came to be in dāger of death when, they had acquired ſtrength enough to receaue both; which notwithſtanding they had been obliged to doe had there been any diuine precept obliging all Chriſtians to receaue both ſometimes or at leaſt once in their liues.

Secondly the ſame difficulty may be preſſed againſt this new hatched opinion, of children arriued to the age of ſix or ſeauen yeares who being accouſtumed in the primitiue Church

to conſumate the particles or reliques of the ſacred hoſts, receaued vnder the formes of bread only, for there is not a ſtep imprinted in antiquity of conferring both kindes to them when they came to dy about that age. The like is of hermites who liued perpetually in the deſerts and had the couſtome of taking with them the moſt bleſſed Sacrament vnder the formes of bread only.

But that which diſcouuers moſt cleerely the non exiſtency of this new fangled opinion, is that it hath noe ground in holy Scripture. for when our Sauiour ſaith Ioh. *6. he who eateth this bread ſhall liue for euer*, whoſoeuer holds this opinion muſt ſay that he who receaues deuoutly vnder the forme of bread only, receaues grace and ſpirituall life in his ſoul; ſuppoſe therefore that ſtill perſeuering in that grace receaued he come to die before he receiue vnder both kindes, certainly he will be ſaued; which ſhewes euidently that the receauing of both kindes before death is not neceſſaty to ſaluation *neceſſitate medij* (as the ſchoole ſpeakes) that is, ſo neceſſary that ſaluation can noe more be acquired without it, then it can be without faith, or the grace of God: neither can communion vnder both kindes be ſaid to be neceſſary to ſaluation *neceſſitate præcepti*, or by diuine precept: for theſe words of S. Ioh. c. *6. niſi mãducaueritis carnem*

nem filij hominis &c. being a mere declaration of a truth, cānot properly be ſaid to be a precept or command and rather ſeemes to include neceſſitatem medij then precepti. and whatſoeuer command may be deduced from thoſe words, or preſſed from any other place of Scripture, I haue allready ſhewed to be of noe force, to put a neceſſitie vppon all Chriſtians to receaue vnder both kindes, either all wayes when they frequent this Sacrament, or at any time in their liues.

What I anſwer to this opinion will eaſily preuent the forging of an other of the like nature that might happily occurre to ſome quaint noueliſt, that though there ſhould be noe neceſſity of euer receauing both kindes at the ſame time, yet theſe words of S. Iohn: *Vnleſſe you eate thē fleſh of the ſone of man and drinke his blood, you ſhall not haue life in you*, import a neceſſity of both eating and drinking at the leaſt at ſeuerall times, now doing the one and then the other, which being done, each Chriſtian may be truly ſaid both to *haue eaten the fleſh and drunke the blood of the ſone of man*, and ſoe ſufficiently to haue fullfilled this declaration of our Sauiour. This imagination, I ſay, is wholy cut of by what I haue anſwered to the former opinion, (to omit the nouelty of this inuention) for the community of Chriſtians, comply ſufficiently with this

command, if ſome receiue vnder the forme of bread, and others of wine, this being amongſt themſelues to haue *both eaten the fleſh, and drunke the blood of the ſone of man*, though each in particular doe not both of them, the command being giuen not in the ſingular but in the plurall number.

Now that I may conuince euen from the confeſſion of our Aduerſaries, that communion vnder both kindes is not neceſſary to ſaluation.

1. Firſt whatſoeuer Luther holds in ſome places, (as he is moſt vnconſtant in his aſſertions) yet in very many others, he clearly defines, that communion vnder both kindes is not neceſſary to ſaluation, nor was euer commanded by our Sauiour. De capt. Babylonicâ, c. de Euchariſt. in Declar. in ſerm. de Euchariſt. à ſe habito. de formulâ Miſſæ. In aſſertionibus. Artic. 16. Epiſ. ad Bohemos Tomo 2. Germanico. fol. 100. In aliâ editione Tomo 7. fol. 360. libro de vtrâque ſpecie Sacramenti: *Si veneris ad locum, in quo vna tantùm ſpecies miniſtratur, accipe tantùm vnam, quemadmodum ibi accipiunt; ſi præbentur duæ, duas accipe, nec quidquam ſingulare infer, nec te multitudini oppone.* *If thou comeſt to a place where one only kinde is miniſtred, receiue one only; if where both, receiue both, and induce noe ſingularity, nor appoſe thy ſelfe to the multitude.* Thus Luther.

2. The

2. The ſame is held by Melancthon, in loc. com. edit. 2. nu. 1551. fol. 78.

3. And in the Engliſh Statutes. In the firſt Parlament vnder K. Edward the 6. pag. 818, In caſe of neceſſity communion vnder one kinde is permitted; neyther is any way condemned the vſe of thoſe Churches where communion vnder the forme of bread only is practiſed.

Which clearly proue that, thoſe Engliſh Proteſtants held not communion vnder both kindes neceſſary to ſaluation.

And here I make an end of this whol treatis, which (had the ſpirit of Chriſtian humility, and obedience perſeuered in the harts of Chriſtians) need neuer haue been begunne; and was vndertaken for no other end, then to let the miſlead ſpirits, of our age and country ſee, how little reaſon they either had in the beginning or now haue, to diſobey the precepts, and contradict the decrees, of theyr noe leſſe tender, then powerfull mother the vniuerſall Church; that being noe other, nor better then a weake pretence of *Scripture miſtaken* the common plea of all ſectaries againſt the generall conſent of Chriſtendome. For this *miſtake* of a few curious and diſquiet Noueliſts, the myſticall body of Chriſt muſt be rent in peeces, Kingdomes and Prouinces ſwinne in each others blood, Churches, and

Religious howſes, the monuments of Chriſtian pyety, raſed and defaced; citties ſacced and pillaged, contries diſpeopled and deſolated, caſtles burned, families ruined, parents bathed in their own teares, theyr children half famiſht, like thoſe of the Iſraelites, crying out for bread, and none found to giue it them; and that I may ſhut vp all, in thoſe ſad lynes of Vincentius Lirenenſis Commonitorio 1. c. 6. ſpeaking of the Arrian bereſie and giuing noe leſſe a true deſcription of thoſe, then a preſage of our tymes, after he had declared how the whol Romane Empire was ſhaken, the weſt and eaſterne Churches eyther by fraud or force, dangerouſly infected, and all things both ſacred and Prophane, diſtempred, and diſtracted, he vſes theſe words, *Tunc temeratæ coniuges, depullatæ viduæ, prophanatæ virgines, dilacerata monaſteria, diſturbati clerici, verberatæ Leuitæ, acti in exilium Sacerdotes, oppleta ſanctis ergaſtula, carceres metalla.* Then maried woemen were abuſed, widdows diſpoyled, of theyr purple mourning garments, ſacred virgins prophaned, monaſteries torne in peeces, clergie men diſplaced, Leuites beaten, prieſts ſent into baniſhment, dungeons, priſons, and mettle mines fild with Saincts. O vnhappy, and accurſed *miſtake*! what miſcheefs haſt thou allready wrought, and art ſtill a working in the bozom of Chriſtendom! how haſt thou hood-

hoodwinkt the eyes, bewitched the eares, clowded the braines, and ſet on fyer the harts of *miſtaken* Chriſtians, who are ſoe deeply beſotted, with thee, that like one in a frenzie, they can neyther beleeue, nor indure to heare that they are *miſtaken*: and yet are not to be deſerted as wholy deſperate and incurable, there is ſtill a ſunne which can dart a beame of light into theyr ſouls, to diſcouer theſe cymerian clouds; a neuer erring truth to correct theſe miſtakes, and a moſt prouident wiſdome, to lead them to the certaine way of ſaluation. Deare contrymen, I haue only expoſed before your eyes (and more I cannot) a cleare looking glaſſe wherin you may behold, the fouleſt, groſſeſt, and moſt dangerous of your miſtakes, and beholding, loath them, and loathing leaue them, though you leaue the whol world, and your own liues with them, for being once diſcouured, left they muſt be, or God will leaue you.

FINIS.

THE INDEX.

A.

ANgels haue been worshipped in Scripture. pag. 34. 35.
Angels indued with supernaturall graces. 16. 17. 18.
How he Arke is called God. 293.

B.

BEza. Translates in all the Euangelists and S. Paul, for is my Body, signifies my Body. 514.
Beza sayes that these words, which is powred out for you, as they stand in the Greeke, are crept out of the margent into the text. 214. 215.
How our Sauiours true body is broaken. 200. 201. 102. 103. Christ neuer said, this is my Body, that is to say, a cõmemoration of my Body. 215. 216. 217. Nor could say soe. 218. 219. &c. S. Paul cals the consecrated elements, the bread, and cup of our Lord. 253. 255. 256. Why the consecrated Hoast is called bread. 265. 266. &c. The Hoast is called noe otherwise bread after consecration, then wine was called water. Io. 6. 196.
Bread taken, but not giuen by our Sauiour. 193. 194. Naturall bread cannot be really the Body of Christ. 213. & 257. True naturall bread cannot be the Body of Christ, as his true flesh is called bread Io. 6. 281. ad 285. The Apostles did not eate bread remaning bread, but bread made the Body of Christ as in Cana of Galilee, they did not drinke water remayning water, but water made wine, 150. 251.

How

C.

How the Chalice is the new Testamẽt. 231.232. &c.
Whol particular Churches aboue 400. yeares agoe communicated publickely vnder one kinde.
How Circumcision is called the couenant. 287.288. Commandements put shorter in one place of Scripture then in other. 114.115. The diuision of the Commandements more reasonable according to Catholicques then Protestants. 118. 119. Noe Commandement left out of the Romane Bibles. 112.113.
Council of Trents Doctrine of, worshipping of Saincts, and Angels. 1.2.3.4. and how they pray to God for vs. ibidem. Concerning Images. 69.70. 71.72.73. Concerning Iustificcation. 137.138. to the 143. Concerning merit of good workes. 162. 163. 164. concerning good workes. 52.53. Concerning Purgatory. 179.180. Of the reall Presence. 189.190. &c. Concerning communion vnder one kinde. 317.318. to 322.
The second Conucil of Nice concerning Images. 83. Communion in one kinde supposes the reall Presence. 323. How the cup is the fruit of the vine. 257.258. &c.

D.

The Diuinity of God neuer pictured by Romane Catholiques. 72.73.
Doe this &c. Signified nothing to be done in time of the Institution. Doe this &c. cannot be extended to lay men. 347. to 350.

Doulia, *is indifferently taken in Scripture for the worſhip of God, and of creature.* 33.34.35.
Drinke yee *all, ſignifies not all Chriſtians.* 34. *to* 346.

F.

FAith *only Iuſtifieth not, prouued by Scripture.* 143. 144. *&c.*
Faith ioynd with other vertues the diſpoſition to the firſt iuſtification. 138.139. *&* 153.
The fleſh, Io. 6. *cannot ſignifie* the fleſh of Chriſt. 303.

G.

Some GLory *may be giuen to creatures but not that which is proper to God.* 26. 27.

I.

IF *all worſhip of* Image, *weere forbidden, one place of Scripture would be cõtrary to annother.* 110. 111.
Image *put for Idol.* 105. *a grauen Image ſignifies a falſe God in the Proteſtant Bibles.* 119.
The name of Ieſus *is as much worſhipped by Proteſtants, as the picture of Ieſus by Catholiques* 28. *VVhat an* Idol *properly is.* 8. 81. *VVhat in* Image *properly is.* 80. 81. *The difference betwixt an Image and an Idol.* 82. 83. *How Images are to be worſhipped.* 124. 125. *Grauen Image ſcarce euer put in Proteſtant Bibles but in place of words which ſignifie Idoles, or falſe Gods.* Image-worſhip *for* Idolatry. 105. 106. Image *added to Scripture.* 95. 96. *&* 98. 101. *&c. The worſhip done to the* Image *redounds to the perſone repreſented,*

proued by Scripture. 132.133. Iuſtification not acquired, but increaſed by good workes. 152. VVhat relation Images haue to God the Fader, and the holy Goſt. 75.76.77.

K.

In one Kinde is a true Sacrament conferring grace. 326. to 330. How theſe words, onleſſe yee eate &c. 10.6. declare the neceſsity of receiuing both kindes. 351. to 355.

L.

Lay people are depriued of noe grace neceſſary to ſaluation, by wanting one kinde. 328. 329. & 334. How one kinde is a compleate refection. 332.333. How the actuall ſacramentall graces of both kindes, are giuē by each apart. 335. & 340. Noe lay man is bound ſome times in his life to receiue vnder the forme of wine, eyther ioynly with the other kinde, or ſeparately. 397.398. How the Lamb is called the Paſſouer. 289. to 293. Latria, is allwayes vſed in Scripcure (when it is brought for religious worſhip) for the worſhip dew to God only. 32.33.34. How eternall life is a giſt of God. 171.172. Luther thought the words of conſecration moſt cleare. 313.

M.

Mediatour and Aduocate of 2. ſortes. 60.91.62. 63. Merit of good workes takes not a way humility. 175.

P.

The Hebrew word Pheſel, Exod. 20. *falſſly tranſlaeed Image.* 84. 85. Pheſel *tranſlated Idol in ſome Proteſtant Bibles,* Iſay 44. 85.

Proteſtants *pray as much to ſinners on earth, as Catholiques to Saincts in heauen.* 58. 59. *Proteſtants worſhip bread and wine, as much as Romane Catholiques worſhip Images.* 129. 130. *Proteſtants themſelues eſteeme it not neceſſary to ſaluation to communicate vnder both kindes Diuiſions amongſt Proteſtants, and not amongſt Catholiques in matter of the vnderſtanding Chriſt words.* 243. 244. *Proteſtants beare little or noe reuerence to the bloud of Chriſt in this Sacrament.* 367. *Proteſtants frame a moſt meane opinion of the Body, and the blood of Chriſt.* 365. 366. *Noe Scripture againſt* Purgatory. 182. 183. *&c.*

Proofes *out of Scripture for Purgatory.* 187.

Six miſtranſlations in Ex. 20. 4. *in the* Proteſtant *Bibles.* 91. 92. 93. 94.

R.

Religion and Religious taken in 2. ſenſes, in Scripture. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. *That which our Saviour gaue his Apoſtles in his laſt ſupper could be noe remembrance of his Body.* 222. 223. *&c. How any thing may be a remembrance of it ſelfe.* 227. 228. 229. *How the Rock is called Chriſt.* 295. *to* 296.

S.

Sacraments according to theyr eſſentiall parts are to be receiued, as they were inſtituted, whenſoeuer they

*they are receiued.*325. *The bare institution of a Sacrament induces to necessity no receiue it.* 3.
Saincts and Angels *prayree to God for vs, are herad only trough the merits of Christ.* 58.&62. *The worship of liuing Saints as much forbiddē in Scripture, as of Angels.*35.36. *VVhensoeuer by praires we come to the Saints, we come mediately, but truly to Christ.* 56.57. *Iintreating the Saints to pray for vs is not a necessary meanes, but a profitable helpe to saluation.* 1.2.3.& 65. *Saints indowed with supernaturall graces.* 16.17.18.
Saturday *commanded to be Kept holy.* Ex.20.116. 117. *The vvords of* Scripture *are allways to be vnderstood properly, vvhen noe other article of faith compells vs to the contrary.*315.416. *The Scriptures allowes of praying to Saints departed, and Angels.*66.67.68. *Noe text in* Scripture *saies expressly that vve are iustified by faith only.* 149.&c. Scripture *mistrauslated.* 78.79. 80.81.& 88.89. *and from* 95. *to* 127.128. Scripture *eyther mistranslated, or misinterpreted, or misapplied, or misused, or augmented, or altered, or reiected, and generally mistaken one vvay, or other by Protestants.* *per totum.*
The seauenth day not Sunday, but Saturday, and the Iewish Sabbath. 116.
All Seruice *is not dew to God only.* 29.30.

T.

VVhat is meant by new Testament.235.236.&c.

Teſtament in my blood, *is not to ſay*, ſigne of my blood. 239.
Threſkia, *ſignifies not vvorſhipping but* Religion. 45.46.47.
Perpetuall tradition teaches, that ſome allwayes receiued vnder one kinde. 370.
Objections drawn from naturall reaſon againſt Tranſubſtantiation breefly anſweared. 306.312.
The torment of death, or of triall of malefactors touches not ſouls of the iuſt. 158.

W.

WHat the word this *ſignifies, in, theſe vvords,* this is my Body. 107.108. *&c.*
VVords haue two ſignifications, ancient, and now in vſe. 30. *ciuil and Eccleſiaſticall.* 31.32.
VVords of Scripture are not to be extended beyond theyr ordinary ſignification, vvithout neceſsity. 361. *to* 364. *VVhen vvords ſpoaken to the Apoſtles are to be extended to others, and how farre.* 334. 344. *The vvords of conſecration vvholy true according to Catholiques.* 245.246. *The vvord* eſt, *is, cannot be* ſignifies. 301. *VVhich are* workes *of the law.* 149.150. *&c. and* 156.157. 158. *&c. All* Good workes *and vvords are the gifts of God.* 164. God workes *vvhich are fruits faith are pleaſing and acceptable to God in Chriſt, according to Engliſh Proteſtants.* 167.
The difference betwixt vvorſhip & ſerue. 123.
To vvorſhip God is not to vvorſhip him only. 6.7. 8.9. *vvorſhip of* 3. *kindes.* 9.10.11. *Religious* worſhip

worſhip *ſtrictly taken dew to God only.* 11.12. *Taken in a large ſenſe, may be giuen to creatures vvhich are indewed vvith ſupernaturall graces.* 12.13.14n15.16.17.*&c. Creatures commanded to be vvorſhipped.* 108.106. *S.Iohn is as much forbidde to vveepe by an Angel, as to vvorſhip.* 36. 37. *The vvorſhip vvhich the Romane Church giues to Saints and Angels cannot be giuen to God vvithout blaſphemy, and ſacrilege.* 25.26. *Creatures may be vvorſhipped vvith the vvorſhip of Doulia.* 19.20. *The vvorſhip of Latria giuen in Scripture to God only.* *The Angel Reuel.* 22. 89. *might forbid S.Iohn to vvorſhip him out of humility, as S.Peeter did forbid Cornelius,* Act. 10. *pag.* 25.26.37.38.39.40.*&c. S. Paul forbids noe vvorſhipping of Angels, but vvhat makes them equall vvith Chriſt, or ſuperiour to him.* 48.49. *Heathens vvorſhipped as Gods, the materiall Idoles vvhich vvere before them.* 84.85.*&c.*

FINIS.

APPROBATIO CENSORIS.

FIde probatorum Virorum, & Theologorum, mihi sufficienter constat, hunc librum cui titulus *Scripture mistaken*, &c. anglicè scriptum nihil continere quod non sit doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, & bonis moribus consonum, ideoque typis mandari potest. Antuerpiæ hâc 23. Iulij 1655.

C. Voochts Archidiaconus Antuerp. & lib. Censor.

SVMMA PRIVILEGII.

PHILIPPVS *Dei gratiâ Hispaniarum & Indiarum &c. Rex Catholicus, Archidux Austriæ, Dux Burgundiæ, Brabantiæ, &c. Serenissimus Belgarum Princeps diplomate suo Regio sanxit, ne quis intra decennium citra* IACOBI MEVRSII *Typographi Antuerpiensis voluntatem hunc librum, cui titulus* Scripture mistaken, &c. seu Tractatus de locis S. Scripturæ malè intellectis à Nouatoribus Anglis, *Auctore* R. P. IOANNE SPENSERO Soc. IESV, *vllo modo imprimat, aut alibi locorum impressum in hanc Prouinciam importet, venalemúe exponat. Qui secùs faxit confiscatione librorum, & aliâ graui pœnâ multabitur: sicut latiùs patet in litteris datis Bruxellæ 24. Aprilis 1655.*



De Fren.